

*Anecdota Oxoniensia*  
THE  
AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA



EDITED FROM THE MANUSCRIPTS  
IN THE INDIA OFFICE AND THE LIBRARY OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
WITH INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, NOTES, INDEXES  
AND AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE PORTION HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED  
OF THE ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA

BY

ARTHUR BERRIEDALE KEITH

OF THE COLONIAL OFFICE



Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1909

HENRY FROWDE, M A  
TUTORIAL TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD  
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK  
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE



## PREFACE

THIS book owes its existence to the Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Dr A. A. Macdonell, who suggested to me the writing of it, and who secured its acceptance for publication by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press. Professor Macdonell was also so good as to read the proofs of the first three sheets before he left England in 1907 for his tour in India, and for this and all the other help he has given me in the course of my Sanskrit studies I desire to express my most sincere thanks.

The editing of the text has been rendered possible for me by the liberality of the India Office and of the Royal Asiatic Society, which lent to me the manuscripts on which the text is based. To the Secretary of the Society, Miss Hughes, and to the Librarian of the India Office, Mr F. W. Thomas, I owe grateful acknowledgements of the assistance afforded me in this and other ways.

I have tried by the translation and commentary to extract as much as possible from the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, as I recognize that a text of this class should as far as practicable be made by its editor to yield all that can be derived from it for the knowledge of the period when it was produced. With this end in view I have added a series of Indexes which contain in great fullness the lexical material of the work while the material will also serve for grammatical purposes, as in each case the precise form which occurs is specified. I need make no apology for the distinction made between the Mantra, the *Āraṇyaka*, and Sutra forms, not to distinguish the different strata of the text would be merely misleading.

In the commentary I have tried to avoid repeating what can easily be found in such standard works as the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, Colonel Jacob's *Concordance* to the *Upanisads* and Deussen's treatise on the *Philosophy of the Upanishads*. Nor have I thought it worth while to note in detail the verbal coincidences between the *Aitareya Brahmana* and the *Āraṇyaka*. As might be expected they are constant and show unmistakably the connexion of the two works. Some other points arising out of the book I hope to deal with elsewhere.

I had not originally any intention of including in the book the text of a portion of the Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka which now forms the appendix. I hoped that Dr Friedlander would complete his projected edition of that text, and it was only after a considerable portion of the book was in type that I learned that there was little or no prospect of the appearance of an edition at any early date. I then obtained the permission of the Delegates to print so much of the text of the Śāṅkhayana as was unpublished, and the Royal Asiatic Society were so good as to include a translation of the whole Aranyaka in their series of Oriental Translations, and to publish an article of mine on the Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka in the Journal of the Society for 1908. The translation and the article will be found to supplement in some important points the information as to the Śāṅkhayana contained in this book.

The printing of the work has occupied over two years, and has entailed a good deal of trouble on all those concerned with it. I desire to express my thanks to Mr R. W. Chapman, of the Clarendon Press, for the interest which he has taken in it and for valuable suggestions which he has made from time to time on points of form. It gives me also much pleasure to acknowledge the great pains taken by the Oriental Reader of the Clarendon Press, Mr J. C. Pembrey, Hon. M.A. of Oxford, in dealing with the proofs. For such errors as remain I must accept responsibility. This is the fourth book of mine which has had the advantage of Mr Pembrey's care and skill, and I feel that it would be difficult to exaggerate the value of his assistance.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH

LONDON

July 11 1909





## CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I
I The Text	I
II The Commentaries	11
III Divisions of the Āranyaka and their date	15
IV The Mahavrata ceremony, and the relation of Autareya Āranyaka I and V to the Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka	26
V The Upanisads of the Autareya Āranyaka	39
VI Style and Grammar	62
TEXT AND CRITICAL NOTES	76
TRANSLATION AND NOTES	161
APPENDIX ŚAṆKHAYANA ĀRANYAKA VII-XV	305
INDEXES	329
I Quotations from Rgveda	329
II Quotations from other sources &c	334
III Proper Names excluding those of Deities	342
IV Words in Verses other than Rgvedic &c	344
V Words in Āranyakas I-III other than words in quotations	354
VI Words in Āranyaka V and in the parallel passages of Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka I and II other than words in quotations	378
VII Beginnings of Khandas of Āranyakas	385
VIII Introduction and Notes	388

# THE AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA

## INTRODUCTION

### I The Text

WHEN, in June 1905 I commenced preparations for the production of an edition of the Aitareya Āranyaka, I was mainly influenced by the expectation raised in part by the reference in Prof Buhler's Report<sup>1</sup> on his Kashmir journey to differences in the text in a birch bark MS, that it might be possible to amend considerably the text of Rajendralala Mitra's edition. Rajendralala used only two complete MSS of the text, and three of Sayana's commentary, besides three other MSS of parts of the text or commentary and it seemed reasonable to suppose that the employment of additional MS material would add to the correctness of the text. This expectation has not been justified. The use of additional MSS enables me to correct a good many slips and one or two serious omissions in Rajendralala's text but it establishes the fact that the tradition as to the text seems unbroken. Variant readings occur here and there but none of sufficient importance to justify the idea that any different recensions of the text ever existed and it is hardly ever possible to feel serious doubt as to the correct reading. What is especially important is that MSS from both the extreme north—as Buhler's MS from Kashmir—and the south agree in presenting the same text. Further the commentary of Sayana presents the same text as the commentaries of Sankara on Books II and III, and of Ānandī-tirtha and Viśveśvara on the same books.

### The MS Material

The MSS which directly or indirectly have been used for this edition are as follows —

1 A This MS is dated *sarvat* 1654 (= A D 1797) and contains the text of the Āranyaka complete. It belonged to Colcbrooke, who

<sup>1</sup> *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society* 1877 Extra No p 34

annotated it, and used it when writing his *Essays*. The substance of his note on the authorship, *Essays*, I, 46, occurs on fol 60<sup>r</sup> of the MS. The MS is No 76 in Eggeling's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS in the Library of the India Office*, Part I. Written on paper in Devanagari.

2. B This MS is on birch-bark and in Sāraḍa characters. It contains the Rgveda Samhitā the Khilakanda, and on ff 188<sup>v</sup>-191, the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Book III, only. It was discovered by Prof Buhler, and the information it offers regarding the Khilas is discussed by Prof Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxxi. See also Max Muller, *S B E*, I, lxxviii, lxxix, who used it in preparing his translation of the Upaniṣad, and Dr Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, pp 32 sq, 167, 168. It probably dates about A D 1575<sup>1</sup>.

The variants of this MS have been referred to as important, both by Buhler and Dr Scheftelowitz. This view appears to me erroneous. Whatever may be the value of the MS for the criticism of the text of the Rgveda<sup>2</sup> it contributes, in my opinion not a single correction to the text of Āraṇyaka III. It contains many errors e.g. *prajaya*, *prajayah* for *prajāyā*, *samhitāya* for *samhitāya*, *sandhny* for *sandhnyā*, *abhyasam* for *abhyāsam*, &c. Most of its variants can be proved incorrect from the context. In III, 1, 4, *cen* is omitted in the first clause, but in the second *cen* occurs and it is most improbable that the word should be omitted in the first of two precisely parallel clauses. Then also *chaknuḥ antam* is read without the negative, which reduces the passage to nonsense. In III, 1, 5, *putra* is omitted before *rupam* but the context urgently requires its presence, the words *putra aha* are also omitted, but leave *madhyamāḥ* unintelligible, and *ekikurvan* for *anekikurvan* is contradicted by the next clause. In III, 1, 6, a whole clause is omitted because it begins and ends with the same words as the preceding clause, *tam* is omitted in a Rgvedic quotation while by diplography *sa saṁsaditih* stands for *saṁsaditih*. In III, 2, 1, an unnecessary *iti* is inserted before *etat proktam*, presumably because an *iti* is expected with the form *proktam*, and the whole phrase *trayam tv eva na śy etat proktam* is repeated in III, 2, 2, where it is not in place. In III, 2, 1, it is required because it contradicts a view of Hrasva Mandukya that there was a fourth class. In III, 2, 2, the threefold division is accepted. The same tendency to

<sup>1</sup> See my note, *J P A S*, 1907, p 275.

<sup>2</sup> Cf Oldenberg *Gott gel An.*, 1907, pp 235 sq.

diplography is seen in the double *akar* in the same section. In III, 2, 3, the obvious *brahmanam* appears for *brahmānam*, but just before we have *brahmā rasah*. In the list in III, 2, 2, *manomayah* is wanting, but it appears in the precisely similar list in III, 2, 3. Another omission is seen in *nasyanukte*, III, 2, 4, for *na tasyanukte*, and 'mato has fallen out between 'gato and 'nato. The defective *āskandati* is balanced by *jīvaśyati*.

Other alterations are inferior in sense. In III, 2, 4 *vāśariram* for *vāśirasam* after *jīvaśīrasam* postulates the possibility of perceiving a disembodied spirit, which is difficult, *caṇḍrama evādityo*, *ibid*, is inferior to *vādityo*, *apagirati* is required rather than *avagirati*, &c.

The only passage in which B offers at first sight a better text is III, 2, 6 *Prajapatih prajah sista vjasiamsat a samvatsaram*, where it may be suggested to take *a samvatsaram* as = over a year. This is not quite impossible but it is not likely, and then the proper form is undoubtedly the middle, cf *śisramsata*, *Āitareya Brahmana*, III, 27, &c. Further, it is very difficult to see how the standard text could ever have been altered from this reading. But palaeographically the corruption found here is quite easy. *d* and *t* are not very different in Saradī MSS, and *t* actually appears for *dh* in III, 2, 3 *anuvitan* for *anuvāḍham*, a much less easy mistake. Then *a* and *ā* are often interchanged, as in *amritam* just cited, and in *anyam*, III, 2, 3, for *anyani*, *anusamhitam*, III, 2, 6, for *anusamhitam samvatsaram* may have followed when *a* became *ā*, or have been an independent attempt at an easier reading.

Other errors are the interchange of *a* and *ā*, *śamhitah*, III, 1, 1, for *śamhitah*, *batirakam*, III, 2, 4, for *batarakam*, of *a* and *e* the characteristic stroke for the latter being omitted *agnar* and *ratrisuktana*, III, 2, 4. *r* is treated like *ri* and so written in *rite*, III, 2, 2, so in the *Khulas*, V, 3 *rajrin rājase* is written for *rajrum*, cf *Scheftelowitz*, p. 175. *i* and *ī* are also confused.

In some points the MS is accurate. Before gutturals and labials the appropriate sign for *h* is used. For *h s* or *h ś*, *śś* or *śś* always occur, and anusvara is practically never misused. After *r* and *m* duplication of consonants is regular, and for *d ha* is always written *d dha*.

But on the whole, I consider the MS, though in many ways valuable, yet to contain many corruptions due in part to the errors inevitable in transcription and copying of Saradī MSS and in part to attempted correction of the text. The result of the comparison with the text of the

Āranyaka and with the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka leads me to look with doubt on the readings of the MS where they differ from other sources

3 C This MS was written in *lake* 1385 (= A D 1663), *śobha asadhatat* 7 *dhrgan* by Saradanandavamsodbhava Mahadeva. The first sixteen leaves, however, are in a different hand and originally formed part of another MS. They contain part of Book II, while the rest of the MS contains part of Book III (ff 17-103) and the last Khanda of the third Adhyaya of Book V, in each case with Sayana's commentary. See Eggeling No 83. Written on paper in Devanagari.

4 D This MS is one of the Whish collection in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society. It is on palm leaves and in Grantha characters, legible and not very incorrect. See Thomas in Winternitz *Catalogue of South Indian Sanskrit Manuscripts*, No 191. It contains the Āranyaka complete. Its probable date is A D 1700.

5 E This MS was presented by Dr Burnell to the India Office. It is fairly well written in Grantha characters on palm leaves. It is No 84 of Dr Burnell's collection, see *Catalogue of a Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Part I *Vedic Manuscripts*. It contains the Āranyaka complete. It probably dates from the eighteenth century.

6 F This MS belonged to Colonel Claud Martin and like G appears to have been presented to the India Office by Colebrooke. It forms part of a corpus consisting of the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra Purvasatka (ff 1-20) Uttarasetka (ff 1-11) Grhya Sūtra (ff 1-17) Sarvanukramani (ff 17-24) and Āranyaka (ff 25-35). It contains the Āranyaka complete. See Eggeling No 80. Written on paper in Devanagari about the end of the eighteenth century.

7. G Like F this MS belonged to Col Claud Martin, and was presented to the India Office by Colebrooke. It also contains a corpus consisting of Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, Purvasatka (ff 1-64), Uttarasetka (ff 1-40), Grhya Sūtra (ff 1-26) Sarvanukramani (ff 1-28) and Āranyaka (ff 1-45), complete. See Eggeling No 79. Written on paper in Devanagari about the end of the eighteenth century. This MS is closely connected with F.

8 H This MS contains the commentary of Visveśvaratīrtha on a commentary by Anandatīrtha on Books II and III of the Āranyaka. The text is not cited in full but the commentary shows that it was identical with the text of Sayana. See Eggeling No 84. Written on paper in Devanagari in the seventeenth century.

See Eggeeling No 87 Written on paper in Devanāgarī in *sauvat* 1853 (= A D 1796)

18 25  $R^{1-3}$  are the MSS used by Rajendralāl Mitra for his edition, *Aitareya Aranyaka with the Commentary of Sayana Acirja Bibl Ind*, Nos 325 329 335 337, and 345 Calcutta, 1875-1876 Their description is (Intro d, pp 20, 21) as follows —

$\tilde{A}a$  (=  $R^1$ ), lent by Pandit Vamana, of the Benares Sanskrit College dated *sauvat* 1816 (= A D 1759) *irodhisamvatsare karttikasuklasaptamyaṃ Viśveśvararajadhanyam* It contained the commentary of Sayana on the whole *Āranyaka*

$\tilde{K}ha$  (=  $R^2$ ), from the Sanskrit College at Calcutta, containing Sayana's commentary on Books I and II Apparently old

$\tilde{G}a$  (=  $R^3$ ) from Dr G Buhler of Bombay, dated *śraṇanavadi* 30 *śamvatsare* sake 1788 (= A D 1866) *śrāṇanamamamvatsare*, containing the commentary complete

$\tilde{G}ha$  (=  $R^4$ ) copied for Rajendralāl under the superintendence of Babu Amṛtalāl of Benares and collated with two different codices the codex copied being dated *sauvat* 1828 (= A D 1771) *śraṇanavadi* 3 It contained the commentary complete

$\tilde{K}a$  (=  $R^5$ ) copied for Rajendralāl under Amṛtalāl's superintendence and collated with a MS dated *sauvat* 1775 (= A D 1718) *śrāṇanamamamvatsare dakṣinayane vaiśākhya bhādrapade mass kṛṣṇapakṣe bhīṣṇasare taddine pustakam samāptam* It contained the text complete

$\tilde{K}ha$  (=  $R^6$ ) copied for Dr Burnell of Mangalore and lent to Rajendralāl The original belonged to a pandit in Tanjore It contained the text complete Cf E

$\tilde{G}a$  (=  $R^7$ ) from the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal containing Book II only of the text, written in the saka year named Vyaya by Narayana of Candrapura for his master Śivarama

$\tilde{G}ha$  (=  $R^8$ ) from the Library of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, containing Book IV, with Sayana's commentary

Of these  $\tilde{k}a$  and  $\tilde{k}ha$  (presumably  $R^2$  and  $R^6$ ) are said to belong to the same class But it is clear that Rajendralāl merely compiled an eclectic text from the various MSS and that he did not contemplate a critical text  $R$  denotes the reading of the edition when it appears to rest on all the MSS available

26-34  $S^{1-8}$  are the MSS used in the edition in the Anandasrama

series, 1898, No 38, with Sāyana's commentary by Bābāśāstri Phadake. They are as follows —

*Ka* (= S<sup>1</sup>), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Śrīmat Gummahārāja, of Karavīrapura

*Kha* (= S<sup>2</sup>), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Gangādhara Sāstri Dātāra, of Puṇyapattana

*Ga* (= S<sup>3</sup>) and *Gha* (= S<sup>4</sup>), containing text and commentary complete, from the Ānandāsrama library

*Na* (= S<sup>5</sup>), containing text and commentary of Books II-IV, belonging to Bhāūsāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrāpura

*Ca* (= S<sup>6</sup>) and *Cha* (= S<sup>7</sup>), containing text only, from the Ānandāsrama library

*Ja* (= S<sup>8</sup>), containing text only, belonging to Bhāūsāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrāpura

*Jha* (= S<sup>9</sup>), containing text only, belonging to Śankarārāva Bhāgavata, of Thāne.

There is no doubt that some care has been taken in giving the variant readings which are practically confined to the commentary. Where the MSS appear to agree, S is used to denote the reading of the edition. The text of the Āranyaka in this edition contains some errors and omissions, but is superior to that of Rājendralāla.

**35. T.** This is the version found in the collection of 108 Upaniṣads published in Telugu character at Madras in 1883. It contains no important variants, and seems conclusively to prove that the South had no separate recension. See Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads des Veda*, p 534. In view of Sankara's influence in Southern India, this was only to be expected.

**36. U.** This symbol is used to denote the text of the Upaniṣad with Sankara's commentary, Ānandatīrtha's super-commentary, and with Vidyāranya's (Sāyana's) *Dīpikā*, published in the Ānandāsrama series, 1889, No 11. For this edition were used five MSS (*ka, kha, ga, gha, na*) of the text, commentary, and super-commentary, six MSS (*ca, cha, ja, jha, tha, da*) of the commentary, two MSS (*ka, kha*) of the text alone, and four MSS (*ka, kha, ga, gha*) of the *Dīpikā*, besides two editions (*ña, ta*). The variants are, however, almost confined to the commentary.

**37. W.** This MS contains Sāyana's commentary on Book I of the Āranyaka. It is on palm-leaves and in Malayālam characters, and is very

inaccurate. It is one of the Whish MSS in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society. See Winternitz, No 1 (b), who assigns it to the eighteenth or nineteenth century.

38 X This MS contains Sankara's commentary on Books II and III of the Āraṇyaka. It is written on palm leaves in Maṭṭyaṇāṃ characters. The MS is much damaged. It is No 158 in Winternitz's *Catalogue*, and may be assigned to the seventeenth century.

Of these MSS I have collated all save R<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>, S<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>, and those used in U. There are many other MSS and editions of the Upaniṣad in existence and several MSS of the Āraṇyaka (see *Aufrecht Catalogus Catalogorum*, s. vv.) but there is no reason to suppose that any of them would add anything new to the text. Max Müller used (cf. *SBE*, I, xcvi) a MS of the text with Sankara and Ānandatīrtha's commentaries, and also a commentary by Sankara<sup>1</sup> on Book III, Adhyaya 1, but he states that the MSS he used gave little aid. It appears from Weber's *Catalogue* that the Berlin MSS have no independent value.

The MSS used are on the whole decidedly inferior. They are modern copies and contain many clerical errors. No useful purpose would be served by recording all the blunders of the scribes. I have therefore printed only those which seemed of more importance, either textually or palaeographically, save in the case of B, in view of the special—if somewhat artificial—interest of that MS.

In Rājendralāla's edition, and in Max Müller's translation of the first three books of the Āraṇyaka (*SBE* I) the text besides the division into Adhyayas and Khandas shown in all the MSS, is divided into short sections which are numbered. These numbers seem to be attributable to Rājendralāla himself, as there is no trace of them in any of the MSS I have used or in the Ānandaśrama edition. The divisions follow the treatment by Sayana of the text in his commentary, but they cannot be said to be always satisfactory, consistent or convenient, and I have not felt bound to adopt them. None of the MSS show any satisfactory or consistent punctuation—such a punctuation being practically unknown in Sanskrit MSS of prose works—and I have therefore adopted what seemed to me the most convenient punctuation.

<sup>1</sup> That this is the correct description of the work follows from a comparison with X though the MS does not name the author (Wickremas inghe *JRAS*, 1901, p. 632).



In the Upanisad (II 4-6) within the Khandas there is a division into sections in accordance with Sankara's commentary which differs greatly from that of Sayana, and which has been adopted in the editions of the Upanisad. This enumeration might have been retained for convenience of reference, but for the sake of consistency I have preferred to omit it.

With regard to the text of Sāyana's commentary it may be observed that neither Rājendralāla nor the Ānandaśrama edition gives a very correct version. It is clear that Rājendralāla freely corrected his MSS, and that even the numerous variants given in the Ānandaśrama do not exhaust the variations of reading. Curiously enough the editors of the latter cannot have consulted the former. For example the commentary on *madhumati* in V, 2, 2, reads *saraso* (*casau* is suggested as a correction) *madhavadimadhuryarasopetatvan madhumaṇ*. Rājendralāla has *sa ca somayādīmadhuryarasopetatvan madhumaṇ* which, as the noun is (*upa*) *prakṣe* glossed as *jagapradakṣe*, is neat and convincing. Or again V, 2, 1, where Rājendralāla has the obvious *savaḥ 2 airmanī balaṇ*, while the Ānandaśrama has [*2 airī*] *nam* [*2 avo?*] *balaṇ* while just after *in ativyathā* is rendered according to Rājendralāla *enam śatruṇi atisajena calitavan*, and according to the Ānandaśrama *imam śatruṇi* &c. One MS, S<sup>2</sup>, has *santum*, and of course there is no easier mistake in MSS than that of *tr*, *tt*, and *nt*, while interchange of sibilants is constant. Or again in the quotations at the end of V, 1, 5, both editions present bad texts but Rājendralāla has *etac karma* while the Ānandaśrama has *etac ca karma*, which in view of the context is absurd. Many other instances could be quoted, and undoubtedly either in many places Rājendralāla's MSS were superior or his critical judgement was better, probably the former. Further, there are repeated,—sometimes very serious, e.g. I, 5, 2,—omissions in the Ānandaśrama text, and in places, e.g. I, 5, 1, the text has been badly confused.

On the other hand, there are many instances where the Ānandaśrama text is superior to that of Rājendralāla. For example the note in the latter edition on II, 3, 4, p. 226, line 3 from foot *dhyamajjāṃ<sup>2</sup> anenakapaḥṣak* is meaningless, but a perfectly good sense is given by the Ānandaśrama reading (see note on II, 135) *Dhūmanajjāṃ*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the absurd reading in the ed. of Latipajana Śranta Sūtra III, 1<sup>a</sup>, 11, *Dhānariyāḥṣak*.

The comparison of the two editions would give a satisfactory text in all respects save in quotations from unknown works. In these Rajendralāla is usually superior to the Ānandaśrama but neither is very accurate, and further MS authority would be requisite.

From a comparison of the recorded readings the MSS of the commentary appear to be divisible into the following classes: (1) R<sup>1</sup>, and R<sup>2</sup>, with which may be classed C, and so far as it goes I, (2) S<sup>1</sup>, S<sup>2</sup>, S<sup>3</sup>, S<sup>4</sup>, which approach closely to class (1)—in this class S<sup>1</sup> and S<sup>2</sup>, and S<sup>3</sup> and S<sup>4</sup> are closely related, (3) S<sup>5</sup> which falls into a distinct class of its own, (4) R<sup>3</sup> and R<sup>4</sup> which again form a distinct class, and (5) W.

The MS material available would not suffice to form a text either of Śankara's commentary on the Āranyakas II and III, or of Visveśvara's super commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on those Āranyakas the more so in the latter case that no MSS of the commentary itself have yet come to light.

In the edition of Rajendralāla and in the MSS A and E only are accents used. These accents are clearly confined to those verses not occurring in the Rgveda Samhitā which are quoted in full in the Āranyaka V. Unfortunately in the edition the accents are often obviously incorrect, one word having two accents, or a series of words being incorrectly accented so as to show that an error in printing must have taken place. The MSS also, as often, are carelessly and inaccurately accented, and it is therefore not possible to lay stress on the accentuation of any rare words, especially compounds. The matter is of little consequence, however, as the total number of accented words is small and nearly all, save a few compound words are recorded in well accented texts.

It may here be mentioned that I have, wherever necessary, restored correct spellings, e.g. *pattram* not *paṭram*, and have in accordance with the normal practice of the MSS,<sup>1</sup> omitted visarga before a sibilant followed by a hard consonant. In the case of *ck* I have never inserted the *c*<sup>2</sup> but in deference to the ordinary practice I have always written *tad dhi*, not *tad hu*, and of course *uddhṛtya* for *ud hṛtya*. On the other

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Macdonell *Bṛhaddevala* I xxvi, n. 4. Allowed by Vārttika on Paṇini, VIII 3, 36.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar* § 277. In Lanman's edition of Whitney's translation of the Atharvaveda *ck* is

written everywhere even when *ck* represents an assimilated letter + *ck*, e.g. *bhacant*, in which case *ck* is used in this edition. Cf., however, Wackemagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 154 sq., Macdonell *Vedic Grammar*, p. 31.

hand, duplication after *r* has been omitted, though it is usual in all the MSS, while the *avagāha* is inserted wherever it is properly required despite its omission in the MSS. The nasal in *Pluta* is represented by the *aṇḍicandra* mark. In R the ordinary *anusvāra* is used as is done in the MSS, but not in S.

## II The Commentaries

The commentaries on the *Āraṇyaka* which I have used are the following —

1 *Śaṅkara's* commentary on the *Upaniṣad* (II, 4-6). *Śaṅkara's* date has now through the evidence of the *Āryavidyaśudhāra* and *Pathaks* researches (*Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVIII, 88, 218 sq.), been definitely fixed from A D 788 to the middle of the ninth century. The date A D 820 formerly assigned to his death, must refer to the commencement of his labours. This commentary has been repeatedly printed, best in the *Anandaśrama* series Poona, 1889.

2 *Śaṅkara's* commentary on Book II, the first part of the *Mahātareyopaniṣad*. This is only available in the MSS P and X, neither of which presents an accurate text. In the *Adhyāyas* 4-6, it is of course identical with (1). Fortunately the analogy of *Sayana's* commentary on *Adhyāyas* 4-6 and comparison of the two commentaries on *Adhyāyas* 1-3 establish the fact that *Sayana* followed *Śaṅkara* with considerable fidelity.

3 *Śaṅkara's* commentary on Book III, the *Sambitopaniṣad*. This is only available in the MS X but is followed by *Sayana*.

4 *Ānandatīrtha's* super commentary on *Śaṅkara's* commentary on the *Upaniṣad*. *Anandatīrtha* is said to have died in A D 1198 and to have been a pontiff of the *Madhva* sect (*Bhandarkar, Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 1882-1883 pp 18-103). The date has recently been questioned by *Harikṛṣṇa Śāstrin* (*Epigr Ind*, VI, 261) who prefers to date him from A D 1238-1317, on epigraphic evidence of considerable weight. This commentary has frequently been printed, best in the *Anandaśrama* series. As has been mentioned above in several MSS the commentary is attributed to *Abhinavanāraṇyendra*, who in one of the MSS in the Bodleian Library (*Catalogue*, No 977) is thus described: *śrī śrīmatkāṭyaśāstrīnārāyaṇendrasarasvatīpūjyapadaśiṣyāśrīmatjñānaśrīdrasarasvatīpūjyapadaśiṣyāśrīmadalīnārāyaṇendrasarasvatīnācāryaḥ* *Atiśayabhīratikāyaḥ* ! There can be little doubt but that we

must assume Ānandatīrtha's real name to have been Abhinavanārāya-nendra Sarasvatī, especially as he is indifferently called Ānandatīrtha, Anandagiri, or Anandajñāna, the name he probably took as pontiff.<sup>1</sup> Cf also No 1010 (3) in the *Catalogue*, where he is called Narāyaṇendra Sarasvatī.

5 Viśveśvaratīrtha's super commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on Books II and III. This is only available in the MSS H and O, and no MSS of the commentary itself appear to be extant. Ānandatīrtha, who is called *bhagavatpadacarya*, must, I think, be identical with the Ānandatīrtha above mentioned, and must have written two different works in connexion with the *Aranyaka*, first the super-commentary on Śāṅkara's commentary, and second an independent commentary on the *Āranyaka*, in which he interprets it in a Vaisnava sense. Max Müller (*S B E*, I, xcvi) appears to doubt this identity, but it must be remembered that Ānandatīrtha was a Madhva and so not unlikely to be disposed to adopt a Vaisnava interpretation and that there is nothing rare in Indian literary history in finding an author ready to comment on both sides of a question. Compare the case of Vacaspatimiśra,<sup>2</sup> who wrote commentaries on the works of all the philosophical schools save one. Further the interpretation of Śāṅkara had always to contend against that of Ramanuja,<sup>3</sup> and it was by no means unnatural for a scholar like Ānandatīrtha to set forth both views, the Vaisnava interpretation representing his own.

Viśveśvaratīrtha appears to have been the pupil of Ānandatīrtha, and to have written this work in the lifetime of his master, as is indicated by verse 3 of the introduction *Aitareyopaniṣado 'vākurmo bhāṣyam uttamam | brūmadanandatīrtharyam natā tatpratikamulak || 3 ||* It is worth noting that Jayatīrtha, the successor of Ānandatīrtha similarly wrote a super commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on the *Praśna Upaniṣad*, and that that commentary is distinct from Ānandatīrtha's super commentary on the commentary of Śāṅkara on that Upaniṣad.<sup>4</sup> The same remark<sup>5</sup> applies to Ānandatīrtha's commentary on the *Īśavasya Upaniṣad* and to his super commentary on the commentary of Śāṅkara

<sup>1</sup> So Jayatīrtha's original name was Raghunātha, Bhandarkar l c.

<sup>2</sup> See Cowell and Gough *Translation of Sarvaśāstrasamgraha* Preface p v l n 1.

<sup>3</sup> See Thibaut *S B E*, XLVIII, *J P A S*, 1906 pp 490-93.

<sup>4</sup> See the *Bibliothèque Catalogue*, No 1013 (2).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid* No 1013 (3).

on that Upanisad Viśveśvara was evidently closely connected with Anandatīrtha, as a MS of Anandatīrtha's super commentary on Sankara's commentary on the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad of the seventeenth century is described by a later hand as *Viśveśvaranandatīrthamathastham* (Bendall, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum*, p. 15). Bendall I c, refers to a commentary by Viśveśvaratīrtha on the super commentary of Anandatīrtha on the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, but the evidence cited above leaves little doubt but that the commentary of Viśveśvaratīrtha is on an independent commentary by Anandatīrtha and not on his super commentary. The exact locality of this Math is unknown but Jayatīrtha it may be noted, was a native of Mangalavedhem near Pandharpur.

6. *Sāyana's* commentary on the whole Āraṇyaka. Besides the edition of Rajendralala Mitra and that in the Ānandaśrama series I have used MSS C, I and W. There are many minor variants in the text but there is no trace of any double recension. In the Ānandaśrama edition of the Upanisad the commentary is attributed to *śrīmatpara mahānīlavarīraṇyaka-cārya-vidyāranyamuni*. This as Kleinm has shown in the *Gurupūjā-kāṇḍī*, is the title of Madhava the brother of Sayana, and not of Sayana. This attribution to Madhava is an error, Sayana in the preface tells us distinctly that the work is his *tātkāksena tādṛṣṭvā dadād bukkhamalupatī 1 adīśat Sayana-cāryam vedārthasya prakāśane* || 3 || In all probability it was genuinely composed by Sayana himself, it agrees with his Rgveda commentary in general and was written after the commentary on the Aitareya Brahmana. It was written probably under Bukka I, who was certainly reigning in A.D. 1354. That Sayana died in A.D. 1387 is probably an error, though that may be the year of Madhava's death. His commentary throughout is dependent on that of Sankara on Books II and III, as he admits in the introduction to Book II.

Sankara, Anandatīrtha in his super commentary, and Sayana all interpret the Upanisads in II and III in the light of the Vedānta. On the other hand Viśveśvara in the super commentary follows Anandatīrtha in giving a Vaiṣṇava interpretation. I have not followed either view. The Upanisads can only be satisfactorily explained by regarding them as what they are, early attempts at philosophy, and by refraining from reading later ideas into them. The interpretations given by the com-

mentators have, however, a value as showing the development of philosophical ideas, and I have therefore whenever desirable referred to them. In several cases too they afford great assistance in the interpretation of the text.

It may here be mentioned<sup>1</sup> that most of Book II, that is, Adhyāyas 1-3, 4, and Adhyāyas 4-6, are translated by the author of the Persian translation which was made for Dara Shukoh between A.D. 1656-1657, and retranslated into Latin in 1801, 1802, by Anquetil Duperron. This translation, besides being much less intelligible than the original, adds, as far as I can see, nothing substantial to our knowledge.

The commentary of Śaṅkara establishes for the ninth century the text of the second and third books of the Aranyaka as we now have them. Whether there were variants in his time we cannot determine with certainty, as his text has clearly alone formed the subject of study. The other commentators all depend to some degree on him. Ānandatīrtha, in his own work, uses him, and Sayana uses both him and Ānandatīrtha. The evidence for the time before Śaṅkara is wanting. The later Upanisads borrowed their doctrines and phrases from works which were more developed and displayed more literary pretensions than the Aitareya, while the secular literature makes no direct quotations. All we can say is that the Moksadharma of the Mahābhārata and Bādarāyana in his *Brahma Sūtra* (III, 3, 16, 17) probably used the Aitareya Upanisad,<sup>2</sup> but the next evidence is again Śaṅkara's commentary on those Sūtras.

Though strict proof beyond Śaṅkara cannot be attempted, there is no reason to doubt the integrity of the text of these books. They are not, in subject-matter, open to easy interpolation, and in all probability in their present form they fairly represent their original shape in the time of Śaunaka.

Nor is there any special reason to assume alteration in the verses which make up Book IV for which there is considerable independent evidence.

For Books I and V we have no earlier authority than Sayana. But he appears to have had before him a fixed text, and the various readings which he gives are practically limited to the last chapter of V, 3, the contents of which certainly lay it open to interpolation yet Sayana of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, I, 171 sq.; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads*, pp. 535 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 78. English Translation, p. 29, and, for the Moksadharma, note on II 5.

course was not the first to write a commentary on the Āraṇyaka. He expressly refers, on V, 1, 1, to differences of interpretation, as to whether *tvasya abhivayasaḥ* (RV, X, 160, 1) meant four verses or one only according to rule, and on V, 3, 3, he refers to differences both of reading and of opinion. We are therefore justified in regarding the text he gives as practically a *textus receptus* by the fourteenth century A.D.

Whether or not it is original cannot be answered with certainty. Amongst others, Hillebrandt (*Sankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, pp. x-xv) considers that the text of the Sūtras is much altered from the original, but in the case of the Āraṇyaka I, or V, it would be difficult to prove this doctrine, inasmuch as the Āraṇyaka seldom presents the truly remarkable variety of rules and exceptions shown by the present text of Sankhāyana. Further the text of the first book assists in checking the fifth book, and appears throughout to agree with it. Again in the former case, where the work is a true Āraṇyaka, the idea of later alteration is less probable than in a formless work like the fifth book, which is practically a Sūtra itself. Moreover, although a certain fluidity of text may be admitted in the Sūtras, the extent of such fluidity appears to be greatly exaggerated by Hillebrandt.

### III The divisions of the Āraṇyaka and their date

There is some uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the word Āraṇyaka. Śāyana gives two somewhat different interpretations of it. In the preface to the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* (Aufrecht's edition, p. iii) he describes it as *Aranyavratarupam brahmanam*; in the preface to the Āraṇyaka itself he says *Āitareya brahmane 'sti laṇḍam Aranyaka bhūdhām | aranya eva pithyatvad aranyakam itirjate* § 5 and *sattra prakaraṇe nuktir aranyadhyaṇayaḥ hi | mahāvratasya satyatra kauṭram karma vivijate* § 8. The latter view is energetically supported by Oldenberg<sup>1</sup> and is adopted by Macdonell<sup>2</sup>. The former has the support of Weber<sup>3</sup> and Deussen<sup>4</sup> argues in favour of it on the ground that the aim of the Āraṇyakas was to supply a substitute for the sacrificial rites to be used by Vānaprasthas. This view, however, is rather far fetched. The Āraṇyaka seems originally to have existed to give secret explanations of the ritual, and to have presupposed that the ritual was still in use and was known. No doubt the tendency was for the secret explana-

<sup>1</sup> *Prolegomena* i p. 298

<sup>2</sup> *Indian Literature*, p. 28

<sup>3</sup> *1111 septuaginta der Upanishad* 1, p. 3

<sup>4</sup> *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 34

tion to grow independent of the ritual until the stage is reached where the *Āranyaka* passes into the *Upaniṣad*, and contemporaneously the life of the Hindu is differentiated into the four *Āśramas*. But originally an *Āranyaka* must have merely meant a book of instruction to be given in the forest.

It is not now possible to decide exactly why the *Āitareya Brahmana* does not deal with the *Mahāvratā* rite. In Sayana's time it was already held that the author of the *Āitareya Brahmana* was also the author of the *Āitareya Āranyaka*, Books I III,<sup>1</sup> and Sankara may conceivably have held the same view, as he calls the *Upaniṣad* the *Bahvṛcabrahmana Upaniṣad*.<sup>2</sup> It is however, impossible to accept this version as correct. It is probable enough that Mahidasa *Āitareya* is the editor or arranger of the *Āitareya Brahmana*, as Aufrecht thought. It is true that the *Āitareya Brahmana* is not in all probability the work of one hand or period,<sup>3</sup> but it must have been at some early date welded into one work, and tradition may fairly be considered to have given us the name of the man who did it. We know from Panini V 1, 62, that in his day Brahmanas of thirty and forty *Adhyāyas* existed and Weber's<sup>4</sup> conjecture that the reference is to the *Saṅkhayana* and *Āitareya Brahmanas* is almost certainly correct. But though we can fairly ascribe to Mahidasa the arrangement of the *Brahmana* it would be incorrect to ascribe to him even the first three books of the *Āranyaka* since in them he is cited as a teacher. He is named expressly in II, 1, 8 and 3 7, and is clearly referred to in I 1, 1.<sup>5</sup> This must be taken as decisive<sup>6</sup> against his authorship of these books of the *Āitareya Āranyaka* though it is clear that some of his views are expressed in them. We may perhaps suppose that Mahidasa besides editing the *Brahmana* was a philosopher of some distinction since otherwise his name would hardly have come down to us. Of his life we know nothing. Sayana tells us a legend of his being the son of

<sup>1</sup> See Aufrecht's edition of the *Brahmana* p 11. Max Müller *SBE* I cv.

<sup>2</sup> Max Müller *IC* p xc 1.

<sup>3</sup> See Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature* p 23.

<sup>4</sup> *Ind. An. Literature* p 45.

<sup>5</sup> So Rajendralala Introduction p 8. Weber, *Ind. An. Literature* p. 48 and cf

Macdonell *Bṛhaddevatā* I xx: for a similar case. See also however Weber *Ind. Stud.* XIII 322 sq. according to whom Patanjali appears to allude to him self in the 3rd person. This however is less likely to be the case at so early a date as that of Mahidasa though later it is not rare.



Itarū; Ānandatīrtha, in his original commentary, describes him as the son of Viśāla and an incarnation of Nārāyaṇa. Perhaps there is some truth in the reference to him in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 16, 7, and the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 2, where he is said to have lived for 116 years, at any rate it shows that he was a famous sage and probably a real person.<sup>1</sup>

The three books attributed to him can on internal evidence be divided into four parts. The **first book** consists of an explanation of the Mahāvratā from a ritualistic and allegorical point of view. It describes the different Śāstras of the morning, midday and evening libations of the Mahāvratā day of the Gavāmayana, a theme touched on in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 1-38, IV, 14, but indulges in further allegorical play of ideas. On the whole it bears a close resemblance in contents and style to the Brāhmaṇa, but it is doubtless more recent in date, or it would have been included in the Brāhmaṇa. Sāyana in his introduction to Book V calls it an *apauruṣeyaṃ brāhmaṇam*, and Śaṅkara calls the Upaniṣad similarly Bahvrcabrāhmaṇa Upaniṣad.

<sup>1</sup> The **second book** consists of two distinct parts. The first, comprising Adhyāyas 1-3, deals with the allegorical signification of the Uktha, that is the Nisikevalya Śāstra, three sets of eighty verses, which was the midday Śāstra of the Mahāvratā, as being Prāṇa or Puruṣa. It is not directly connected with Book I, and it is doubtless later than it. The second part comprises Adhyāyas 4-6, and is the Upaniṣad *par excellence*. It is probably later than part one.

The **third book** treats of the mystic meaning of the various forms of the text of the Saṃhitā, the *nirbhūya*, *pratṛṇa* and *ubhayaṃantareṇa*, and of the vowels, semivowels and consonants. It quotes Māndūkeya and Śākalya among others, and makes use of the above terms to describe the *saṃhitā*, *pada*, and *kvama pāthas* of the Saṃhitā. These are so far signs of late origin, but at the same time the treatment of the subject-matter is at a much earlier stage than that reached by Yāska or the authors of the Prātiśākhya. It will be seen later that its philosophical view is more advanced than that of the Upaniṣad proper, and it can probably be dated about the sixth cent. B.C. This result is important,

<sup>1</sup> The references to Aitareya and Mahātareya in Śaṅkharayana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, and Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra,

III, 4, 4, throw no light on him, and are probably late; cf. Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, p. 390.

as it gives us a lower date for the rest of the earlier books of the Upanisad

The fourth book consists solely of the Mahanamni verses. The presence of these verses is explained by Sayana on the ground that they must be studied in the forest. Their use is set forth by Āśvalayana in his Śrauta Sūtra, VII 12 10, where he says that on the fifth day of the six day Prstha rite after the Marutvatya Sastra, when the Niskevalya Śastra is being performed 'if the Udgatrs make the Sakvarasuman the Prstha Stotra then the nine verses called the Mahanamnis and certain *pūrsa padas* to fill up the lmes, are to be used'. Tradition ascribes this Āranyaka to Āśvalayana. Sadgurusūrya in his account of the works of Āśvalayana, says <sup>1</sup> *dvadasādhyayakam sutram catuskam grihyam eva ca caturtharanyakam ceti hy Āśvalayanasutrakam*. This view, however has been questioned in connexion with the authorship of the fifth book.

The fifth book consists mainly of a description in a Sūtra style of the Niskevalya Sastra the great Sastra of the midday libation of the Mahavrata. It forms a sort of complement to Book I, which is the Brahmana as contrasted with the Sūtra. The natural conclusion is, therefore, that Āśvalayana wrote Book V. The arguments<sup>2</sup> in favour of this view are (1) Book IV contains merely a collection of Mahanamni verses, it is not a Sūtra at all and therefore Āśvalayana cannot have been its author. The reply is perhaps that the verses may have been collected by Āśvalayana and put into the Āranyaka in order that they might be available for being commented on in the Sūtra and that it would therefore be natural to ascribe the Āranyaka to Āśvalayana. It is a sort of Āśvalayana Samhitā like the Sakala Samhitā. (2) It is argued<sup>3</sup> that Sayana in the introduction to Āranyaka V, where he expressly ascribes that Āranyaka as contrasted with I to a Rsi uses the words *tasmad aṣṭasṭya*<sup>4</sup> *samanujasjetyadid adasādhyayan mahatratasya pañcatimsatim ityadī pañcamaranyakam sutram etā*. This would no doubt be quite natural if Āśvalayana were the author of the Āranyaka but it is at least equally natural if Śaunaka was. (3) Colebrooke (*Essays*, I, 307) says, with reference to a Sūtra of the Purva

<sup>1</sup> Max Müller *A Cent Sanskrit Literature* p 238, Macdonell, *Sanskrit* *manṭ* p 11

<sup>2</sup> See especially Oldenberg *S B F*,

*VII*, 134 sq. On p. 135 the words 'fifth and fourth' should be transposed.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rājendralala Introduction p. 10.

<sup>4</sup> i.e. Śrauta Sūtra I, 11

Mīmāṃsā 'It is, however acknowledged that a mistake may be made, and the work of a human author may be erroneously received as a part of the sacred book by those who are unacquainted with its true origin. An instance occurs among those who use the *Bakurich* a *sakha* of the *Rigveda*, by whom a ritual of Āśvalayana has been admitted, under the title of a fifth *Āraṇyaka*, as a part of the *Rigveda*' Rajendralala was unable to discover the source of this statement, and it seems probably to be a confusion of Āśvalayana with Saunika, or it may rather confirm the view of Sadguruśiṣya since IV could be confused with the *Rgveda* but not V. (4) The MSS I and G end *its Āśvalayanoktam Āraṇyakam samaptam*! This however, is a matter of no moment, and probably does not even preserve a tradition of Āśvalayana's authorship of Aranyaka IV. These two MSS, which are recent and inaccurate copies, and are probably ultimately derived from one original, contain collections of works attributed to Āśvalāyana and there is nothing surprising in the fact that they attribute the authorship of the Aranyaka to him. (5) Much more important is the fact which forms Oldenberg's second argument, that in his commentary on the Samaveda Sayana refers (I, p. 19) the authorship to Āśvalayana. But against this solitary reference<sup>1</sup> must be set the facts noted below. (6) There is undoubtedly great similarity between the two works Aranyaka V, and the Srauta Sutra. I think it certain that the author of the Aranyaka knew the Sutra. For example, in V 2 2 *ēṇa brahmanī tīrṣā* stands without explanation, but as Sayana points out the verses referred to are given in Āśvalayana Srauta Sutra, VI 2 6. Again in V, 3 2, occurs *uktam vasatkaranumantranam*, which is not only a phrase used by Āśvalayana himself but is a clear reference to Āśvalāyana Srauta Sutra I 5 17<sup>2</sup>. Further the vocabulary and syntax of the works is identical e.g. the use of *na va* in Āranyaka V, 3 1, as often in the Sutra e.g. VI 5 22, or the phrase *apsi vidarsanajodaharīṣyamah*, or the word *ekapatiṇṇah*. These facts, however, which were not known to Oldenberg merely prove that

<sup>1</sup> But I do not feel sure as to the reference. The words are *bakurich* : *adhyaṅga mahāvratayogapratiṣṭhāna* : *Āśvalayanasmṛitam kṛtānām arāṇyake dhyāyānāṁ śāśanam arāṇyakan* : *its vedatīṇa tyaṇa arāṇyaka*, and there is

clearly some confusion between the Sutra and Aranyaka which discredits the evidence.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also V, 1 5 *uktav ryan* : is not explained but is in the Sutra.

Saunaka knew and used Aśvalayana's work which indeed was only natural since the Sutra deals with the Agnistoma the *prakṛti* of the Mahavrata. It will be seen that this agrees perfectly with the native tradition handed down by Sadguruśiṣya.

There is therefore no sound evidence to ascribe the fifth Aranyaka to Aśvalayana, and Sadguruśiṣya's attribution to him of the fourth Aranyaka remains the most probable<sup>1</sup>. For Saunaka's authorship of the fifth Aranyaka we have the distinct and repeated authority of Sayana. Colebrooke (*Essays* I 46) first pointed out that Aranyaka V, 2, 5 is cited by Sayana on the Rgveda I, 8, 1, as Saunaka's and Max Müller (*S B E*, I, xcvi) says that 'Sayana when quoting in his commentary on the Rgveda from the last books,<sup>2</sup> constantly calls it a Sutra of Saunaka'. Further, in his commentary on the Āitareya Aranyaka he repeatedly refers to Saunaka as the author of the fifth book. E.g. on I, 4, 1, he says *ata eva pañcama Śaunakenodīkṛtaḥ* and again *taś ca pañcama Śaunakena śākhantaram aśṛīṣṭa pañcītaḥ*. See also Sayana<sup>3</sup> on I, 4, 2 (ter), 3 (bis), I, 5, 2 (quater), 3 (bis). These references beyond question show that to Sayana Saunaka was the author of the fifth Aranyaka. There is no conceivable reason why this work should have been ascribed to him unless it was his. Similar as the book is in language to the Śrauta Sutra, yet it is in style less compressed and more intelligible than that work. We have certain evidence that Saunaka did compose similar works for, in the introduction to his commentary on the Sarvanukramanī of Katyayana Sadguruśiṣya expressly records that he composed a Śrauta Sutra which he destroyed when his pupil Aśvalayana had written his Sutra. This tradition would explain the close knowledge of Aśvalayana's Śrauta Sutra, which as we have seen above, the writer of this book undoubtedly possessed. No doubt it is possible that he may eventually have been credited with the authorship of one of the works of his pupil,

<sup>1</sup> With reference to Oldenberg's remark (p. 137) that *Āśv. uliyanaśāstrīkaṃ* cannot refer to the Mahanamsa I would observe that the expression refers to the Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras with the Āraṇyaka IV thrown in.

<sup>2</sup> Book must be meant. Āraṇyaka IV cannot be quoted.

<sup>3</sup> It may be noted that the reference in

the Śāmaveda commentary is probably not the work of Sāyana. His pupils no doubt did much of his so-called work. Cf. the case of the Atharvaveda. Whitney, p. lxxv. The fact that passages in the Śāmaveda commentary are identical with those in the Rgveda commentary is of course quite consistent with this view.

as has been shown to be the case by Professor Macdonell in the matter of the Brhaddevatī, but that is a mere possibility against which tradition is certainly strong. It is impossible to argue that in Śaṅkara's eyes the term *caturthas anyakam* covered the fifth book also, for the two are quite distinct and cannot ever have been combined into one book. Moreover it must be remembered that a Gṛhya Sutra by Śaunaka is referred to by Śaṅkara, and appears to have been known to Hemādri in the thirteenth century.<sup>1</sup> So there is nothing at all improbable in the ascription of the Aranyaka V to Śaunaka.

Now it is possible to throw some light on Śaunaka's date. The Brhaddevatā which is attributed to him, but is certainly not his but the work of a pupil—probably not far removed in date—is posterior to Yaska and anterior to the Sarvanukramanī of Kātyāyana. Kātyāyana, who is in all probability the author of the Śruti Sutra and the Vajisaneyi Anukramanī, is most probably anterior to Pāṇini, since the Sarvanukramanī shows forms earlier than Pāṇini's grammar approves (see Macdonell, *Sarvanukramanī*, p viii, *Brhaddevatā*, I, xxi, xxiii). The argument from the use of Vedic forms is no doubt not certain but the balance of probability is in its favour, and it has been maintained by Buhler (*S B E*, II, xl, *Z D M G*, XL, 527 sq) and Winternitz (*Hochschrituell* pp 13 sq) against the objections of Bohtlingk (*Z D M G*, XXXIX, 517, XLI, 669, XLIII, 598 sq).<sup>2</sup> Thus it appears that Śaunaka<sup>3</sup> must be considerably older than Pāṇini. On the other hand, we must not push him too far back or else it would be difficult to explain how Śaunaka is not cited in Pāṇini. Further, H. Liebig in his *Pāṇini*, ch. iii has shown grounds for the belief that the Aśvalayana and Sankhayana Gṛhya Sutras are in point of language closely connected in time with Pāṇini. It does not, therefore, seem necessary to allow more than 100-150 years between Pāṇini and Śaunaka, and the time may perhaps be shorter.

Pāṇini's date unfortunately is not yet certainly fixed. There is between him and Patañjali not only the Vartikas of Kātyāyana, but also

<sup>1</sup> Caland, *Ainenukt*, p 143; Hillebrandt *Pitaval Literatur* p 26.

<sup>2</sup> Buhler's results are accepted by Hillebrandt (*Pitaval Literatur*, p 24) Jolly (*Recht und Sitt* p 3) and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p 259).

<sup>3</sup> It may also be noted that the anushtups of Śaunaka are of an early type the first pada sometimes ending in - - - - of Oldenberg *S B E* XXX xxxv. So in the Brhaddevatā (Keith, *J R A S*, 1906 p 6).

emendations of those Vārttikas by the Bhāradvājyas, Saunāgas, and others and perhaps a *Sloka-vārttika*, which certainly presupposes a considerable interval of time. Bhandarkar<sup>1</sup> has further adduced evidence of changes in the language and extension of geographical knowledge especially as regards the peoples and places of the south between Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali. Goldstucker<sup>2</sup> and Bhandarkar<sup>3</sup> have adduced evidence to prove that Patañjali was a contemporary of Pusyamitra (B.C. 178-142) and Menander (B.C. 144-120) and wrote his *Mahabhāṣya* in or about B.C. 144-142. This result is by no means certain because even accepting as fixed Pusyamitra and Menander's dates,<sup>4</sup> still in the first place the MSS. of the *Mahabhāṣya* do not all contain the passages in which the statements relied on occur, and in the second place it is always possible that the examples occurred in the *Sloka-vārttika* or in some other earlier source whence they were taken over bodily<sup>5</sup> by Patañjali. It may even be argued that Patañjali is not earlier than the second century A.D. inasmuch as he seems to know the *r* vowel sign, and according to Chinese tradition this vowel sign was a discovery of Nāgarjuna's, and Nāgarjuna's date is possibly in the second century A.D. under Kamska<sup>6</sup>. The latter, however, is probably to be referred to the first century B.C., and it would be a mistake to lay much stress on this argument. The *r* vowel-sign may have existed in grammatical circles long ere Sanskrit inscriptions become usual. Further the *Rajataranginī*, I, 174, is an authority for the existence of the *Mahabhāṣya* in the reign of Abhimanyu of Kashmir, whose date is however now quite uncertain. But whatever be Patañjali's date, there seems little doubt that the examples which point to the time of Pusyamitra and Menander must be genuine and that they prove the existence of some commentary on Pāṇini in the middle of the second century B.C. Kātyāyana is assigned by Hsuen Tsang to 300 years after the death of Buddha, which taking the Chinese reckoning of the Nirvāṇa gives the

<sup>1</sup> *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVI, 269 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Pāṇini*, p. 228.

<sup>3</sup> *Ind. Ant.*, I, 299, II, 59.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Duff, *Chronol. of Ind.*, pp. 14-17. Hoernle and Stark, *Hist. of Inha*, pp. 39 sq. Vincent Smith (*Hist. of Ind.*, pp. 192, 193) arrives at a slightly earlier date.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 224. V. Smith, I.C., ignores the force of this argument. Cf. Lévi, *Théâtre indien*, p. 314.

<sup>6</sup> Kamska's date is most doubtful but see V. Smith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1903, pp. 164, Fleet, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 979, 1907, pp. 171, 1034 sq., Hoernle, *Osteology*, p. 8.

middle of the third century B C as his date. This evidence is not of great weight, but it is not improbably nearly correct.<sup>1</sup> Pāṇini cannot therefore be less than fifty years older than Kātyāyana and must at latest belong to about A.C. 300. The question arises whether this date cannot be put further back. The chief argument against doing so is the use of the word *Yavanāni* in Pāṇini, IV, 1, 49. Doubtless this means Greek (Ionian) writing, but it does not necessarily follow that the word dates from after the invasion of Alexander.<sup>2</sup> Indeed the probability seems to me against this being the case. For it is certainly remarkable that Ionian should be the name given to the Greeks if first made known to India through the invasion of Alexander, whose army was certainly in no conceivable sense Ionian.<sup>3</sup> On the other hand, the Ionian name<sup>4</sup> was evidently the great name in the ears of Persians, and of those subjects who were led into Greece on the expedition of Xerxes, and<sup>5</sup> it must be remembered that the Gandarians were part of Darcios' empire and a contingent from Gandhāra, accompanied Xerxes on the Grecian expedition. If it is borne in mind that Pāṇini was a native of Gandhāra according to Hiuen Tsang, a view confirmed by the references in his grammar,<sup>6</sup> it will not seem far fetched to consider that it was most probably from the older tradition that the name *Yavanāni* was derived. In this connexion reference may be made to the theory of Burnell<sup>7</sup> that the word *lipi* which occurs in Pāṇini, III, 2, 21, is borrowed from the Achaemenidean *dipt*, meaning an edict, a view not at all improbable, and one which supports the view here maintained that it was through the Persian conquest of Gandhāra that the word *Yavanāni* became familiar to India. Goldstuecker<sup>8</sup> argued, indeed, that *Yavanāni* referred to

<sup>1</sup> Cf Wackernagel, *Allindische Grammatik*, I, lx, Fritschel, *Prākṛit Grammar*, p 34; Liebh, op cit, ch II, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 312, where he ascribes him to 150 B C, taking the references to Menander and Pusyamitra to be his.

<sup>2</sup> This view is held by Benfey, *Geschichte d Sprachwissenschaft*, p 48, n 1; Burnell, *Asiatic Grammarians*, p 44; Weber, l c, p. 221; Wackernagel, l c, p lix.

<sup>3</sup> So in Arrian Ionia appears merely

as a province and Ionians as residents therein

<sup>4</sup> We have for this the contemporary evidence of the Athenian Aeschylus and of Herodotus Cf also Busolt, *Griech Gesch*, II, 515

<sup>5</sup> See Herodotus, III, 91, vii, 66.

<sup>6</sup> Cf Weber, *Indian Literature*, p 218.

<sup>7</sup> *South Indian Palaeography*, p 6. Cf Bartholomae, *Indog. Forsch*, III, 176; Wackernagel, *Allindische Grammatik*, I, 222

<sup>8</sup> *Pāṇini*, p 16

Persian writing, but this view cannot be maintained. But Weber himself admits<sup>1</sup> that perhaps the name Yavana may have become known before Alexander's time through the Persian war in which the Indians served as auxiliaries. There is also a striking piece of evidence that Greek writing was known in North India before Alexander's time, coins have been found with Greek inscriptions of pre Alexandrian date.<sup>2</sup> Greek engraved gems of a pattern much earlier than Macedonian times have been found in the Punjab, and the caduceus was known in India by B.C. 325 at latest.<sup>3</sup>

I do not therefore consider that the evidence of *Yavanani* is conclusive as to Panini's date though it certainly shows that he cannot be earlier than the fifth century. Weber<sup>4</sup> also argues that his use of letters as numerals is a proof of Greek influence, but it may be equally well a proof of Semitic influence or a mere independent invention, as indeed seems most likely from the fact that the use remains isolated. Weber's other arguments e.g. that from the date of Apisak<sup>5</sup> rest on too slight a basis to bear serious examination. On the other hand, it is not possible to follow Goldstucker<sup>6</sup> in referring Panini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *survano vate*, VIII, 2. 50, because Panini probably deliberately ignored Buddhism<sup>7</sup> or perhaps lived when the influence of Buddhism had yet to become great. Bhandarkar<sup>8</sup> refers Panini to the beginning of the seventh century B.C. dating Katyayana in accordance with the legend of the Kathasaritsagara in the fourth century B.C., but he does not meet the difficulty as to *Yavanani*, though his proposed date would in some ways suit the history of Sanskrit literature. On the whole I incline to fix Panini's date at about 400-350 B.C. Bohtlingk, in the introduction to his edition fixed the date at about 350 B.C., and Lassen<sup>9</sup> assigned Panini to 330 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> See *Ind. Stud.* IV 89. Berlin *Monatsbericht* 1871 p. 616 n.

<sup>2</sup> Head quoted in Bühler *Palaeographia* p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Vienna Oriental Journal* XIII 307. Fleet *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 531.

<sup>4</sup> *Indian Literature* p. 222 n. Goldstucker *Panini*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>5</sup> *Ind. Stud.* XIII 375 n. On the other side Bhandarkar's argument from 'Sanskrit' is equally unconvincing. Cf.

Weber p. 302 n.

<sup>6</sup> *Panini* pp. 245-247.

<sup>7</sup> Weber *Ind. Stud.* V 139 brings evidence that Pāṇini knew Buddhism. It is not quite conclusive but is very probable.

<sup>8</sup> *Bombay Gazetteer*, I: 140 sq. The legend cannot be relied upon in any particular though accepted by V. Smith *Hist. of India* II 337 n. 2.

<sup>9</sup> *Ind. Alt.* I. 177. *Ergebnisse* I, 2, 1, 2.



If this date is accepted for Pāṇini it is necessary to throw the older Nātyāyana, and therefore Śaunaka, a little further back. Śaunaka may perhaps be assigned to about 450 B.C. or possibly even to 500 B.C., which would then represent the probable date of Book V of the Āranyaka, while the collection of Book IV would be a product of the same period, since the evidence goes to show that Āśvalāyana and he worked contemporaneously.

Now it will hardly be doubted that Books I-III are decidedly older than Books IV, V. This is clearly reflected in the native tradition preserved in Sāyana's distinction between the *apauruṣeyam* character of the first three books and their attribution to the author of the Brāhmaṇa. It is not possible to say how much this means. But it is at least probable that the latest part of the first three books, Āranyaka III, belongs to not later than 550 B.C. and the earlier parts may be dated between 700 B.C. and 550 B.C. It will be seen that there is probably a considerable difference in time between the first book, and the two sections of the second, so that 700 B.C. is not too early a date for Book I.

I do not think that these results need be regarded as in any way surprising. The Brāhmaṇa period, according to Max Muller, probably extended from about 800-600 B.C., and this view has the weighty support of Prof. Macdonell.<sup>1</sup> The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa cannot be far removed in date from the first book of the Āranyaka, but the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, which contains many borrowings from it, is in the opinion of Aufrecht<sup>2</sup> known to Yāska : Now Yāska is certainly anterior to Śaunaka and Pāṇini, for he is cited in the R̥gvedaprātiśākhya,<sup>3</sup> the Brhaddevatā, and is apparently known to the Astādhyāyī. His date cannot, therefore, be reasonably placed later than 500 B.C. and it may go back to 550 B.C.<sup>4</sup> This date is confirmed by the character of the Nirukta which certainly is anterior to either the Prātiśākhya or Pāṇini. If, therefore, the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa was known to him,<sup>5</sup> even that late work must be dated about

1904, p. 442) adopts 350 B.C. If a late date is adopted, then the question of finding a place for the Bhāṭya becomes more and more difficult, cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1904, pp. 435 sq., 457 sq., and (for the date of the Epic) *ibid.*, 1906, p. 2; 1907, p. 682.

<sup>1</sup> *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 12, 202 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Aitareya Brahmana*, p. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> The argument is not certain. It is based on the fact that Yaska, Nirukta, VIII, 22, quotes Aitareya Brahmana, III,

Persian writing, but this view cannot be maintained. But Weber himself admits<sup>1</sup> that perhaps the name Yavana may have become known before Alexander's time through the Persian war in which the Indians served as auxiliaries. There is also a striking piece of evidence that Greek writing was known in North India before Alexander's time, coins have been found with Greek inscriptions of pre Alexandrian date<sup>2</sup>. Greek engraved gems, of a pattern much earlier than Macedonian times, have been found in the Punjab, and the caduceus was known in India by B.C. 325 at latest<sup>3</sup>.

I do not therefore consider that the evidence of *Yavanani* is conclusive as to Pāṇini's date, though it certainly shows that he cannot be earlier than the fifth century. Weber<sup>4</sup> also argues that his use of letters as numerals is a proof of Greek influence, but it may be equally well a proof of Semitic influence or a mere independent invention, as indeed seems most likely from the fact that the use remains isolated. Weber's other arguments, e.g. that from the date of Apisāh,<sup>5</sup> rest on too slight a basis to bear serious examination. On the other hand, it is not possible to follow Goldstucker<sup>6</sup> in referring Pāṇini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *nirvano's date*, VIII, 2, 50, because Pāṇini probably deliberately ignored Buddhism<sup>7</sup> or perhaps lived when the influence of Buddhism had yet to become great. Bhandarkar<sup>8</sup> refers Panini to the beginning of the seventh century B.C., dating Katyayana in accordance with the legend of the Kathasaritsagara in the fourth century B.C., but he does not meet the difficulty as to *Yavanani*, though his proposed date would in some ways suit the history of Sanskrit literature. On the whole I incline to fix Panini's date at about 400-350 B.C. Böhtlingk, in the introduction to his edition, fixed the date at about 350 B.C., and Lassen<sup>9</sup> assigned Panini to 330 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> See *Ind. Stud.*, IV, 89, Berlin *Monatsbericht*, 1871, p. 616.

<sup>2</sup> Head quoted in Bühler, *Palaographie*, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 307, Fleet, *J. K. A. S.*, 1907, p. 531.

<sup>4</sup> *Indian Literaturz*, p. 222, n., Goldstucker, *Pāṇini*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>5</sup> *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 375, n. On the other side, Bhandarkar's argument from *Sanhita* is equally unconvincing, cf.

Weber, p. 302 n.

<sup>6</sup> *Pāṇini*, pp. 215-217.

<sup>7</sup> Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 139 brings evidence that Pāṇini knew Buddhism. It is not quite conclusive, but is very probable.

<sup>8</sup> *Dombey Gazetteer*, I, ii, 140-39. The legend cannot be relied upon in any particular though accepted by V. Smith, *Hist. of India*, II, 137, n. 2.

<sup>9</sup> *Ind. Alt.*, II, 147, *Verapoo*, I, 3, 4, 5.

If this date is accepted for Pāṇini it is necessary to throw the older Kātyāyana and therefore Sāṇaka a little further back. Sāṇaka may perhaps be assigned to about 450 B C or possibly even to 500 B C, which would then represent the probable date of Book V of the Aranyaka, while the collection of Book IV would be a product of the same period since the evidence goes to show that Aśvalayana and he worked contemporaneously.

Now it will hardly be doubted that Books I-III are decidedly older than Books IV, V. This is clearly reflected in the native tradition preserved in Śrīyana's distinction between the *apauruṣeya* character of the first three books and their attribution to the author of the Brahmana. It is not possible to say how much this means. But it is at least probable that the latest part of the first three books Aranyaka III, belongs to not later than 550 B C and the earlier parts may be dated between 700 B C and 550 B C. It will be seen that there is probably a considerable difference in time between the first book and the two sections of the second so that 700 B C is not too early a date for Book I.

I do not think that these results need be regarded as in any way surprising. The Brahmana period according to Max Müller probably extended from about 800-600 B C and this view has the weighty support of Prof Macdonell.<sup>1</sup> The Aitareya Brahmana cannot be far removed in date from the first book of the Aranyaka but the Gopatha Brahmana which contains many borrowings from it is in the opinion of Aufrecht<sup>2</sup> known to Yaska. Now Yaska is certainly anterior to Sāṇaka and Pāṇini for he is cited in the Rgvedapratisakhya<sup>3</sup> the Bṛhaddevatā and is apparently known to the Astadhyāyī. His date cannot therefore be reasonably placed later than 500 B C and it may go back to 550 B C.<sup>4</sup> This date is confirmed by the character of the Nirukta which certainly is anterior to either the Pratisakhya or Pāṇini. If therefore the Gopatha Brahmana was known to him<sup>4</sup> even that late work must be dated about

1904 p. 442) adopts 350 B C. If a late date is adopted then the question of finding a place for the Bha. becomes more and more difficult. Cf. *J P A S* 1904 pp. 435 sq. 457 sq. and (for the date of the Ep.) ibid. 1906 p. 2. 1907 p. 68.

<sup>1</sup> *Sa. skr. t. Literat. re* pp. 12-102 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Aitareya Brāhmana* p. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Weber *I. d. m. Literat. re* p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> The argument is not certain. It is based on the fact that Yaska Nirukta VIII. 2 quotes Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III,

600 B C., and the *Aitareya Brahmana* must be earlier, even apparently including the last ten chapters which are later than the earliest portions of the *Brahmana*. Thus the *Brāhmaṇa* cannot well be placed later than 600-700 B C., and the *Āranyaka I* is not to be dated much later.

Further the early date of even the *Upaniṣad* portions in Books II and III appears to be only what is to be expected from the history of philosophy. The *Upaniṣad* doctrines there set forth are essentially earlier than the doctrines of the earliest Buddhism, which belong to the fifth century B C., and we shall see that the *Upaniṣads* probably belong to the earliest of the extant works (Sect V). Moreover, Buhler (*S B E*, II, xxvii) has pointed out that Apastamba (c. 300 B C.) knows the Vedānta school, which presupposes the full development of the *Upaniṣad*, while Gautama (before 400 B C.) knows even the *Atharvasiras Upaniṣad*, which is cited also in the *Mokṣadharmā* (MBh., XII 12864).

#### IV. The Mahāvratā ceremony, and the relation of *Aitareya Āranyaka I* and V to the *Śākhāyana Āranyaka*

Sāyana in his commentary on V 1, 1, tells us that there are three forms of the Mahāvratā ceremony, according to which it is a one day rite, or a part of an *ahina*, or the second last day of a *Sattra*<sup>1</sup>. But he says that the *Sattra* form is the original or *prakṛta* of the others which are *vikṛta*. The *Sattra* differs from the *ahina* in that it requires that all engaged

8, as *yajñān dr atyān kavir grhātām sjaṭ tam manasā dhyāyē vasatī utīyam*. Now the *manasā* here does not appear in the original but only in *Gopatha Brahmana VIII, 4* *tat manasā dhyāyān vasatī utīyāt*. It is hardly open to doubt that the form found in the *Gopatha* passage must have been before Yaska's mind. For though it is not unnatural for the author of the *Gopatha*, or some other *Brahmana*, who borrowed the main body of his work from other sources, to alter his original by inserting *manasā*, yet it is improbable that Yaska would have made the quotation incorrectly, but for the existence of the alternative version. The instance does not amount to proof, and on

the other hand it may be argued, with Bloomfield (*J A O S*, XI, 375 sq., XII, 1, 11), that the *Gopatha* borrows from the *Vaitana Sūtra* and so is very late. But even assuming that the borrowing from the *Vaitana* is real, yet it is more than possible that the text of the *Gopatha*, a very unimportant work, has suffered interpolation, or perhaps the *Gopatha Brahmana* as we now have it is a working over of an earlier *Brahmana* which itself borrowed from the *Aitareya*. But in any case the *Aitareya Brahmana* is unquestionably much older than Yaska.

<sup>1</sup> For the characteristics of *Sattras* see Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p 154, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 17, 92-335.

should be *dikṣita*, the Hotr being also the *yajamana*, and in that it extends even to a year. In the *ahīna* the Mahāvratā is the tenth day of the Paundarika ceremony, but neither the *ekaha* or *ahīna* form is of importance.

In the Sattrā form the Mahāvratā = the last day but one of the Gavamayana Sattrā which lasts the whole year, and no doubt represents in some way the year. Hillebrandt,<sup>1</sup> who has most carefully examined this question, concludes that considerable alterations in course of time took place in this ceremony. As it stood later and as it is represented in most of our texts, the two important days were the middle day, the Visuvat, and the last day but one, the Mahāvratā, corresponding to the Summer and Winter solstices respectively. But the Tandya Brahmana,<sup>2</sup> certainly an old work, refers to a view, which it disputes, that the Mahāvratā belongs to the middle of the year, and it is clear that Indra is the god *par excellence* of the Mahāvratā. It may be argued with some plausibility that Indra belongs to the beginning of the rainy season, or the middle of June, and certainly the rites of the Mahāvratā show traces of a popular origin, like the celebrations of the Johannistag in Germany.<sup>3</sup> It is not impossible that at one time the Mahāvratā was the first day of the year, when, as the Āitareya Aranyaka, I, 1, 1, has it, Indra slew Vṛtra and became great, and Hillebrandt adduces as evidence of this the month Tisya as compared with the Avestan Tistrya, Sirius.

Once then, in any case, the Mahāvratā may well have been a day of popular festival and worship. The Visuvat day receives scant treatment in the texts, possibly, as Dr Friedlander<sup>4</sup> suggests, because the ceremonies connected with that day were transferred<sup>5</sup> to the Mahāvratā to help to wipe out the popular character of that rite. It is, however, simple to suppose that in the usual manner the Brahmanas seized upon

<sup>1</sup> *Die Sonnenwendfeste in Alt Indien*, Erlangen, 1889. Cf. also Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, Berlin, 1862, II, 282 sq.

<sup>2</sup> IV, 10, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Many examples of such ceremonies are collected in Frazer *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, p. 444, n. 1 does not accept this part of Hillebrandt's theory and it may be

pointed out that the Winter solstice = more naturally the time for rites intended in part to increase the sun's heat, cf. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp. 196, 241 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Der Mahāvratā Abschnitt des Śaṅkhayana Aranyak* 1, p. 2, n. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Liturgically the Visuvat is the *prāṇīta* of the Mahāvratā.

the popular Mahavrata and made it their own by an accumulation of purely technical ritual. At any rate they have left clear traces of the original nature of the ceremony. Warriors, fully armed, pierce with arrows the outstretched skin of a barren cow which is probably a rain spell<sup>1</sup>. An Arya and a Sudra strive on a round hide the Aryan proving victorious, which may be interpreted as a spell to produce sunshine. Servant maids encircle the Marjalya fire with jugs of water on their heads either thrice or until the Mahavrata Stotra is finished evidently as a magic rite to procure sunlight and rain for the crops. Sympathetic magic is shown in the effort to produce fertility by *manthana*. Music is played and obscene language used, both possibly with the same object to terrify away hostile demons, especially as the form of music affected is drumming.

But from the point of view of the Aranyaka these old customs are meaningless survivals. The importance of the sacrifice is purely in the ritual as regards the use of the hymns. The Mahavrata is one of the forms of the Agnistoma<sup>2</sup> and is therefore divided into three parts the morning midday and evening pressing of the Soma. Each pressing has an equal number of Stotras and Śāstras. The morning pressing has the Bahispavamana and four Ajya Stotras and the Ajya and Prauga Śāstras of the Hotr and three Ajya Śāstras of the Hotrakas. The midday pressing has the Madhyandinapavamana and four Prstha Stotras and the Marutvatiya and Niskevalya Śāstras of the Hotr and three Niskevalya Śāstras of the Hotrakas. The evening pressing has the Arbhapavamana Stotra and the Agnistoma Saman together with the Vaiśvadeva and Agnimaruta Śāstras of the Hotr<sup>3</sup>. But in the Mahavrata the morning and evening ritual is mainly derived<sup>4</sup> from the *prākṛti* that is ultimately the Agnistoma and it is the Prstha Stotra called the Mahavrata Saman and the corresponding Niskevalya Śāstra or Mahaduktha which form the important part of the liturgy.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the account in Oldenberg *Peligion des Veda*, pp. 444-445, 506 whose explanations are slightly different and my note on V = 5.

<sup>2</sup> See for it H. Hebrandt *op. cit.* pp. 124 sq. It is a *prākṛti* of all the more elaborate forms and these again are related as *prākṛti* and *vikṛti* in order. So

the Visuvat is a *prākṛti* of the Mahavrata as is the Visvajit.

<sup>3</sup> Eggeling *S. B. E.* XXI 325 gives a comparative table. Cf. Weber *Ind. Stud.* X 535.

<sup>4</sup> This is the explanation of such passages as I. 1. 3 and *śū. Śrīd. Jātakaśika* 1. 11 *pasat r. th. u.*

Śāṅkhaśāstra Āraṇyaka.<sup>1</sup> When as time went on there was felt the need of a formal exposition of the rite as a whole since in neither the Aitareya nor the Śāṅkhaśāstra Āraṇyaka is the account of the rite intelligible as it stands in the case of the Aitareya, as we have seen, a Sūtra like book<sup>2</sup> was added by Śaunaka but in that very book<sup>3</sup> the secret nature of the doctrine is reiterated with the greatest force. The case of the Śāṅkhaśāstra Āraṇyaka is different. No addition was made to the Āraṇyaka, so far as we now know it,<sup>4</sup> but two books, XVII and XVIII, were added to the Śāṅkhaśāstra Śrauta Sūtra. These books were not commented on by Anartīya but by Govindī, and they cannot be regarded as forming part of the Sūtra at his date. In fact we have conclusive proof that to Anartīya the eighteenth, and doubtless also the seventeenth book, was an Āraṇyaka. For in commenting on Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 14, 7, he quotes XVIII, 24-30 as an Āraṇyaka. This fact, the full significance of which does not seem to have been realized by Hillebrandt, supports his view, which was based on other considerations, that the two books are not more recent<sup>5</sup> than the rest of the Sūtra. On the contrary it is at least as probable that they are older<sup>6</sup> but the important consideration is that the Sūtra treatment of the material was still considered too secret for insertion in the Sūtra. We must therefore recognize that at one time the Śāṅkhaśāstra Āraṇyaka, in addition to the Brahmana treatment in Books I and II, contained a Sūtra treatment like Book V of the Aitareya. As Books III-VI of the Śāṅkhaśāstra contain the Kausītaki Upaniṣad and correspond to Book II of the Aitareya, and Books VII and VIII of the Śāṅkhaśāstra correspond in some measure to Book III<sup>7</sup> of the Aitareya, it is not surprising that the Śrauta Sūtra treatment of the so called Books XVII and XVIII should have formed part of the Āraṇyaka.

On the other hand it was not felt that any special sanctity or mystery attached to the Udgātṛ or Adhvaryu's functions. These are described

<sup>1</sup> Books I and II

<sup>2</sup> Book V <sup>3</sup> V, 3-3

<sup>4</sup> Our acquaintance with the exact form of the Āraṇyaka is comparatively limited. Few MSS are extant. Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature* pp. 50, 132. Conell, *Kausītaki Upaniṣad*, Preface p. vi. *Radhakrishnan Catalogue*, No. 976.

<sup>5</sup> Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p. 25.

<sup>6</sup> Or of the same date see my note, *J. R. A. S.* 1907, pp. 410-29.

<sup>7</sup> Weber, *Verzeichnis der Sanskrit Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, II, 5. Friedländer op. cit., p. 24. Book XII=XIII 2, Book XIII=

in the Samhitās and Brāhmanas of the other schools<sup>1</sup> (see the Tandyā Brahmana, IV, 10, V, 1-5, Latyāyana Śrauta Sutra, III, 9-12, IV, 1-3, for the Udgātr, and for the Adhvaryu, Taittirīya Samhitā, VII, 5 8-12, Taittirīya Brāhmana, I, 2, 6, 1-7, Kāthaka Samhitā, XXXIV, 5, Satapatha Brahmana, IV, 6, 4, 1, VIII, 6, 2 3, X, 1, 2, 1, Kātyāyana Śrauta Sutra, XIII, 2, 17-4, 2, and scattered notices in Apastamba Śrauta Sutra, XXII, XXIII). It is worthy of note that in his explanation of the ritual Sayana freely quotes and follows Apastamba, as he does sometimes in his commentary on the Aitareya Brahmana.

The date of the Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, like that of the Aitareya, presents considerable difficulty. As the Aitareya Āraṇyaka with the Aitareya Brāhmana, the Sāṅkhāyana is closely connected with the Kausitaki Brahmana. Vināyaka, the commentator on the Brahmana actually, in one place,<sup>2</sup> reckons the Books I and II as XXXI and XXXII of the Brahmana, and there are clear references to the Brahmana in the Āraṇyaka, while several passages agree even verbally<sup>3</sup>. But though these signs are so far clear evidence that the connexion is close, they tend also to show that the Āraṇyaka is dependent on the Brahmana, and this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that at the time of Panini (about 350 B.C.), there seems to have been known to him<sup>4</sup> a Brahmana of thirty chapters, which Weber<sup>5</sup> must be right in considering to be the Kausitaki. Therefore the Āraṇyaka must stand to the Kausitaki in precisely the same relation as the Aitareya Āraṇyaka to its Brahmana.

Now the relation in time of the Aitareya and Kausitaki Brāhmanas<sup>6</sup> is still open to discussion. The evidence seems to me, however, decidedly in favour of the priority of the Aitareya though that priority is not in all probability a great one. (1) The Sāṅkhayana is a more elaborate work than the Aitareya, it is completed by treating of the Haviryajña as well as of the Soma sacrifice proper, giving the Agnyadhana, the Darsapurnamasa, and the Caturmasyani. It is more probable that the less systematic Aitareya is the earlier. (2) The Sāṅkhayana seems,

<sup>1</sup> Friedlander p. 6, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> On Kausitaki Brahmana, V, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Āraṇyaka, I, 2, with Brahmana II, 1, XIX, 4, XXV, 3, 1, 4, with V, 9, 1, 5, with II, 1, &c.

<sup>4</sup> V, 1, 62. <sup>5</sup> *Indian Literature* p. 45.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 203, 206, Wackernagel, *Altind. u. Gr. Grammatik*, I, cxc, with whose views I do not agree.



as Weber<sup>1</sup> points out, to represent a fusion of the views of Paṅgya and Kausitaki, whereas these names are unknown to the Aitareya,<sup>2</sup> which appears to represent a less dependent point of view and to show more originality. (3) In point of view of style the Śāṅkhāyana is much more condensed than the Aitareya. This fact is open to various interpretations, but on the whole the most probable theory is that the older a work, the less condensed its style, though later again the style becomes freer. This argument, which is applied to the Sarvaṇukramanī and Katyāyana Śrauta Sūtra by Prof. Macdonell<sup>3</sup> appears to me to hold equally well in the case of the Brahmanas. (4) The use of unaugmented tenses is more frequent in the Aitareya than in the Sāṅkhāyana.<sup>4</sup> In favour of the priority of the Sāṅkhāyana the only *prima facie* piece of evidence<sup>5</sup> appears to be the argument from the use of the perfect as a narrative tense. Now I do not dispute the value of this criterion, as the evidence appears to me adequate that so far as Vedic is concerned, the history of the perfect is that of an originally present force, such as persisted in words like *aha* or *veda*, to a narrative use. The perfect in narrative is indeed known to the oldest language, but the growth of the narrative use is decidedly a mark of lateness, and is accepted as such by Wackernagel.<sup>6</sup> But the facts of the case are that in the first thirty Adhyayas of the Aitareya the use of the perfect is usually that of a present and that it is only in the last ten that the perfect is used for narrative, whereas in the Kausitaki Brahmana there are nearly three perfects for every five imperfects. The narrative of Śunahṣepa in Book XXXIII is carried on in perfects but it is universally admitted that the last ten Adhyayas are a later addition, since (1) they have no corresponding

<sup>1</sup> *Ind. an. Literature*, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> According to Aufrecht's Index. Cf. Weber, l. c.

<sup>3</sup> *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* I, xxii. This is borne out by the fact that Pāṇini who is probably later than Katyāyana reaches a further degree of unintelligibility.

<sup>4</sup> Aufrecht *Aitareya Brahmana* p. 429. The omission in the *Lite Jaiminīya Brahmana* is merely a MS. error. Whitney *P. A. O. S.*, May 1883 p. xi.

<sup>5</sup> On the use of *as iṣṭa* *as i* in the

late Book VII with periphrastic perfect &c. cf. Whitney, l. c. The *Jaiminīya Brahmana* has no claim to be deemed early, cf. Oerel, *J. A. O. S.* XVIII, 1, 25, XIX, 1, 103.

<sup>6</sup> *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxx. Cf. Whitney, *Transactions Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1892, pp. 5-34. *Grammar*, p. 296, *P. A. O. S.*, May, 1891, pp. lxxxv-xciv. Wackernagel is wrong in thinking that Whitney does not accept the use as a chronological criterion.

matter in the Śankhāyana, while the Sankhayana Srauta Sutra has a version of the Sunahsepa legend and (2) their subject matter is quite unconnected<sup>1</sup> with the functions of the Hotr at the Jyotistoma rite which is the main topic of the Aitareya. Deductions from the style of the Aitareya Brahmana taken as a whole are therefore very risky, and Aufrecht<sup>2</sup> has conclusively it seems to me, shown that the Taittiriya Samhita in Book VI, which deals with the Soma sacrifice, follows the Aitareya Brahmana, which has thus a just claim to rank as one of the earliest Brahmanas as it is of course indisputably older than the Satapatha Brahmana and the Taittiriya Brāhmana, the latter being admittedly later than the Samhita, which it was clearly composed in order to complete. It is worth noticing that that Brahmana contains in Book III the description of the new and full moon sacrifices which is omitted in the Samhita<sup>3</sup> and it may be considered that this helps to show that the Sankhayana Brahmana in which these rites are treated is later than the Aitareya.

On the other hand no argument either way can be drawn from the prominence of Siva in the Śankhayana<sup>4</sup> since Aufrecht has proved that even the Aitareya Śiva is the great god in his form of Rudra, just as he is in the Satapatha the later books of the Vajasaneyi Samhita and portions of the Atharvaveda. It must be recognized that the deity later known as Siva came at an early period to be the most prominent member of the Hindu pantheon and to represent that striving at pantheistic monotheism which in one or other of its forms is so characteristic of all the developments of Indian religious thought. It is probable that several conceptions have merged in the idea of the later Siva. Originally a god of the storm which destroys<sup>5</sup> he later amalgamated with a god of the forest or wood<sup>6</sup> or rather perhaps with the vegetation spirit which has been rendered so familiar by the studies of Frazer following Mannhardt. Possibly, too, traits of his character are derived from the idea of the evil powers of the spirits of the dead, as

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aufrecht *Aitareya Brāhmana* pp. iv, v.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., p. vi; and in the Notes.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature* p. 180.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Weber *Indian Literature*, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology* p. 77.

<sup>6</sup> Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, pp. 216-224.

suggested by v Schroeder,<sup>1</sup> who regards him as chief of the spirits of the dead. But at any rate he cannot be regarded as a late deity, just as Visnu also belongs to an early period. Another sign of the fact that no very great distance in time separates the two Brāhminas may be seen in the fact that both employ in essentials the same style and language. It is worthy of note that in both the base *enad* occurs in the nominative.<sup>2</sup>

It seems, therefore, practically certain that at least the first thirty Adhyayas of the Aitareya are earlier than the Kausitaki and the temptation is strong to assume that the fact that the Kausitaki has precisely thirty Adhyayas is due to an imitation of the Aitareya. If this is so then we would be sure that the last ten Adhyayas were later than the Kausitaki, a view itself extremely probable on the ground of contents and of the use of the perfect as a narrative tense. But even so the Brahmana as a whole of forty Adhyayas is older than Pāṇini.<sup>3</sup> Further the Paingya, who is cited as an authority in the Kausitaki is, according to the Kāśika on Pāṇini IV, 3, 105, a *civāntana*, so that the Kausitaki, like the Aitareya, can claim considerable antiquity.<sup>4</sup>

If the Aitareya Brahmana is older than the Sankhayana, it is not unreasonable to expect the same relation to exist in the case of the Aranyakas. This certainly is borne out by comparison of the ritual described. It at least appears to have been deliberately modified to differentiate it from the ritual of the Aitareya. It is not of course conclusive that the Aranyaka itself is necessarily later, since the description of the earlier ritual may be the later, but there is nothing to suggest that this is the case, and the condensed style of the Sankhayana appears more modern than that of the Aitareya.

Even in the Brahmanas the ritual differences begin to appear. The Prauga Sastra at the Pratahsavana of the Agnistoma and of the Visuvat, following the model of the Agnistoma consists of Rgveda I, 2 and 3, in *gayatri* metre.<sup>5</sup> In the Visuvat, according to the Kausitaki Brahmana,<sup>6</sup> the Sastra is in *tristubh* metre, though the other form is mentioned as

<sup>1</sup> *Vienna Oriental Journal*, IX, 248.

Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1074 d.

<sup>2</sup> V, 1 62.

<sup>3</sup> Cf Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 455.

<sup>4</sup> Bergaigne, *Journal Asiatique*, VIII,

13. Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 29. Kausitaki Brāhmana XIV, 5.

<sup>5</sup> VIII, 3.

<sup>6</sup> Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmana*, p. 429. As the Aitareya example occurs in VII, it is possible that it is a case of imitation. In VII, 17 the periphrastic perfect with *asa* occurs, a very late form.

more correct, and consists of verses from different hymns on the model of the Aitareya form. But most of the differences<sup>1</sup> occur in connexion with the most important part of the Āraṇyaka, the Mahaduktha Govinda, the commentator on the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, tells us<sup>2</sup> that the parts of the Mahaduktha are the parts of the human form and not of the bird form. This is borne out by the words used, *akṣā, bāhū, prahastakam*, and the omission of the *vyarah* and *pucham*. The bird form is the older, it is that of the fire altar and of the Mahavrata Sāman, and probably it is to the change of form that the confusion in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka is due.

In the Aitareya the Mahaduktha is divided into parts corresponding to the body, neck, head, vertebrae, wings, stomach, then comes the food of the bird in the form of the three *asitis*, the *vasā* hymn, and ten miscellaneous hymns called the *uru*. The Śāṅkhāyana divides the Uktha into the body, head with neck, the two sides, divided into shoulder, arm, and hand, the back, consisting of the *caturuttarant* the food in the form of the three *asitis*, together with the *udara*. Then, as the beginning of the end, come the *tripadas*, which in the Aitareya form the tail, the *Aindragna sūkta*, the beginning of the *uru* in the Aitareya and a collection of disconnected groups of verses, *arapana, tristupakata*, &c. The explanation of this confusion seems to be<sup>3</sup> that the human form had no *pucha* and required fewer verses for the *pakṣa*, and so the verses necessary to make up the total of 1,000 *brhati* verses, required by the rite, were appended at the end. To the alteration in form is probably to be attributed the fact that the sides are composed of equal numbers of verses whereas in the corresponding Sāman one side has the Pañcadaśī, the other the Saptadaśa Stoma, and in the Aitareya one side has 101, the other 102 verses,<sup>4</sup> probably, as Dr. Friedländer suggests, because in flight one wing of a bird appears longer than the other.

A similar complication is made in the case of the three *asitis*<sup>5</sup>. In the Aitareya the *gāyatrī* and *uṣṇih asitis* are composed of eighty *gāyatrī* and (with a slight exception) *uṣṇih trcas* respectively, while the *brhati asiti* contains eighty *sato-brhati* verses. In the Śāṅkhāyana the *brhati asiti* consists of eighty *brhatīs* and eighty *fragāthas* (*brhati* and *sato-*

<sup>1</sup> Friedländer, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

<sup>2</sup> V III, 2, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Friedländer, p. 11, who has discussed

very carefully this question.

<sup>4</sup> I, 4, 2.

<sup>5</sup> For the details see notes on V, 2, 3-5.

*brhati*) The additional syllables are added to the *usnik asti* which is composed of *gayatri*, *brhati*, and *pragathas*<sup>1</sup> The priority of the Aitareya is quite clear Again in the Aitareya the hymns corresponding to the Brhat and Rathantara Samans stand on the right and left wings of the bird in the Śāṅkhayana they no longer correspond to the Sāmans in position, but are grouped at the end<sup>2</sup>

The apparently deliberate divergence from the Aitareya appears also in the treatment of the verses from the Rgveda used in the litanies For example, the *usnik asti* in the Aitareya commences with Rgveda VIII, 12 and 13, in the Śāṅkhayana the order is simply reversed Again in the *vara* hymn, VIII, 46, in the Aitareya only vv 1-20 are prescribed, since they alone are addressed to Indra, in the Śāṅkhayana<sup>3</sup> the whole hymn, though vv 21-24 are a *dānastuti*, and vv 25-28, and 32 are addressed to Vayu Similarly at the evening Soma pressing the Aitareya used the Viśvedeva verses, 1-41, of Rgveda, I, 164, only, while the Śāṅkhayana improperly uses all the verses

There is yet another sign of the earlier character of the Aitareya, as far as its Sutra part at least is concerned The Sutra part of the Śāṅkhayana the so called Śrūta Sutra when mentioning<sup>4</sup> the various improper rites, says *tad etat puranam utsanuam na karyam*! There can be no doubt that this is a clear sign of a more reflective and refined age

Further, the language of the Śāṅkhayana suggests a close relation with the Aitareya, which must either be due to a common source, or perhaps more probably to borrowing For example, in the Aitareya<sup>5</sup> occurs *brahmatad ahar brahmanava tad brahma pratipadyate*, in the Śāṅkhayana,<sup>6</sup> *brahmatad ahar brahmanava tad brahma samar dhyate* On the whole the priority probably lies with the Aitareya

If, as seems clearly the case the ritual of the Śāṅkhayana is more recent than that of the Aitareya an interesting question arises as to the relation of the Aitareya I to the Satapatha Brahmana VIII and IX in which the Mahavrata is treated The evidence<sup>7</sup> available on this point is not decisive (1) In LV, 3, 3 19, occurs the expression *janḥ aptacaita-rūṁśat tau catvurimsau pakṣau* which certainly points to the equality of the *pakṣas*, and, possibly, to the human form as the object of

<sup>1</sup> II, 10.<sup>2</sup> II, 16.

consecutively

<sup>3</sup> II 11 Vv 29, 31, 33 are also addressed to Indra but they do not run<sup>4</sup> XVII 6, 2<sup>5</sup> I, 2 2<sup>6</sup> I 2<sup>7</sup> Friedlander, op cit p 14

comparison as contrasted with the unequal and longer wings of the bird (2) In the same passage it is said *yam trayastrimśat sa vasah*, and, as we have seen above the thirty three verses of Rgveda, VIII, 64, are employed in the Sankhayana only, the Aitareya using but twenty (3) In the third verse of Rgveda, X, 120, corresponding to the body, the Aitareya, V, 1, 6,<sup>1</sup> omits the second half and fills up the gap with a pada from the verses for the right and left wings. The Sankhayana Sruta Sutra, XVIII, 14 7, omits the half verse, and puts nothing in its place, but puts the half-verse together with the second half of the verse called *nada*, Rgveda, VIII 69, 2, before the *dispadas*. Now the Satapatha, VIII, 6, 2, 3, refers to *ardharcau*, which name fits better the case of the Śāṅkhāyana, with its two half verses existing independently, than that of the Aitareya, where two separate pādas (not half verses) are interpolated to make up one missing half-verse. Dr Friedlander holds that the other points<sup>2</sup> in the account of the Satapatha, which is far from being a clear one, seem to throw little or no further light on the matter, and it is quite possible that the Satapatha represents a version older than the Sankhayana. But he appears to have overlooked one or two indications which tell strongly against this theory. It is clear from Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, that the general arrangement of the Sastra in the Mahavrata was similar to that of the Śāṅkhāyana, the *vasa* hymn being followed by the *dispadas*, the *Amudragna sukta*, and the *arapana*. What is still more significant is that the *asitis* are clearly composed in the same way as in the Śāṅkhāyana, for the direction in Sankhayana Aranyaka, II, 20, to take twenty four sets of four syllables from the *lakubh pragathas* has a parallel in VIII, 6, 2, 3. Finally, the priority of the Sankhayana appears definitely established by the fact that in X, 4, 2, 19, the Satapatha distinctly condemns the use of seventeen priests, which, as Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 348, n. 1) points out, is laid down by the Sankhayana Book X as undoubtedly of the same period as or at least not earlier than Books VIII and IX, and to argue from it to the date of these Books is perfectly fair. It would probably therefore be best to regard the Satapatha as exhibiting a version which is later than, but which does not

<sup>1</sup> Not, however, in I

<sup>2</sup> Eggeling, in his translation, *S B E*, XLIII, naturally followed the Aitareya,

the only source then available, but save in the points above noted, the Śāṅkhāyana does not help

necessarily follow throughout the Sāṅkhayana version, I do not think even that version would satisfactorily explain all the details of the Śatapatha

It does not of course necessarily follow that the Śatapatha is later than the Aitareya Aranyaka I, but on the other hand this result is by no means impossible. For by common consent<sup>1</sup> the Śatapatha is one of the youngest of the great Brahmanas. It is no doubt anterior to Pāṇini, and as far as the controversy<sup>2</sup> over the Sūtra, IV, 3, 10, yields any results it is that Kātyāyana considered that Yājñavalkya was a *purāṇa*, as opposed to a recent author though therein it seems he disagreed with Pāṇini. It is abundantly clear<sup>3</sup> that the name Śatapatha was well known to Kātyāyana. But there is nothing inconsistent in this with the view that the Śatapatha in its present form may be younger than the Aitareya Aranyaka I. It will be seen in Section VI that grammatically the Aranyaka I-III is older than Śatapatha Brahmana, I-V, X, XII-XIV.

It is perhaps well here to mention a theory recently put forward by Dr Hoernle<sup>4</sup>. He points out that in Śatapatha Brahmana XII, 2, 4, 10, the word *grivāḥ* which occurs in Aitareya Aranyaka I, 3, 4, is used to denote the seven cervical vertebrae, whereas in the R̥gveda and Atharvaveda it seems to denote the throat or windpipe. This view must he argues have been derived from the medical school of Yājñavalkya's day that of Atreya and he refers to the fact that Indian tradition assigns both Yājñavalkya and Atreya to the time of Buddha, the sixth century B.C.<sup>5</sup> Clearly much stress cannot be laid on this argument as far as it might be applied to fixing the date of either the Aitareya Aranyaka or the Śatapatha Brahmana XII. For though

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 203, 217. The Jaiminīya may be younger of its use of *adhi* Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, May 1883, p. 211.

<sup>2</sup> Weber *Int. Stud.* XIII, 443-444. *Indian Literature*, p. 130. Bühler *S. E. A. S.*, II, xxviii n., XII, xxxv. It seems usually to be considered that Kātyāyana was right. But the evidence seems rather the other way as Āpastamba calls Yājñavalkya's contemporary Śvetaketu an *atara* and this agrees well with

the theory here maintained.

<sup>3</sup> Vārti La on IV, 2, 60.

<sup>4</sup> *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 918-919. It is hardly accurate to regard Yājñavalkya as the author of the Brahmana. His opinions are represented—in that fidelity we know not—in part only of it and even that part must have been written by his pupil as of Weber *Indian Literature*, pp. 120 sq.

<sup>5</sup> For Buddha's date see Duff *Chronol. of India*, p. 6, and especially Fleet *J. R. A. S.*, 1904, pp. 301-355.

*grivah* in the former work no doubt refers to cervical vertebrae, as the context shows, yet the passage shows none of the detailed knowledge of the Satapatha (*grivah pañcadasa | caturdasa va etasam karukaravijam pañcadasaṁ*), to which it is certainly prior, as we have seen on other grounds. But the tradition connecting Yajñavalkya with Buddha's date is probably inaccurate, for the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad must, I think, be counted as earlier than Buddha and yet it is later than the mass of the Brahmana, and Yajñavalkya is to it a figure of ancient fame while we are hardly yet in a position to decide the date or opinions of Atreya, since we can scarcely assume that Cṛaka represents him, through Agniveśa, with much accuracy. But it may be noted that the later date of the Satapatha is distinctly indicated by the fact that Apastamba<sup>1</sup> calls Svetaketu a contemporary of Yajñavalkya modern, while the Kausitaki Brahmana which also<sup>2</sup> cites Śvetaketu shows again a connexion with the Śatapatha which denotes its posteriority to the Aitareya.

# V The three Upanisads of the Aitareya Aranyaka

There is some doubt as to the exact designations borne in early days by the Upanisads contained in the Aranyaka. According to Max Müller,<sup>3</sup> the distinction is between the Aitareya Upanisad properly so called which fills the fourth, fifth and sixth Adhyayas of the second Aranyaka and the Mahaitareya Upanisad also called by a more general name Bahvrca Upanisad which comprises the whole of the second and third Aranyakas. There is no doubt that the term Aitareya Upanisad especially belongs to II 4-6 but the term Mahaitareya or Bahvrca brahmana Upanisad, though it sometimes<sup>4</sup> applies to both Aranyaka II and III, sometimes<sup>5</sup> is confined to Aranyaka II. Further the form, Bahvrca brahmana Upanisad is in the Anandasrama edition given to the Upanisad itself, while on the other hand, in one of the MSS. in the Bodleian<sup>6</sup> the second book is described simply as Aitareya Upanisad. Clearly the nomenclature was not definitely fixed. Book III bore the

<sup>1</sup> Bühler *S. B. E.*, II 322 viii.

<sup>2</sup> XXVI, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *S. B. E.* I xcv.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. in Winternitz and Keith *Calendar of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* No 1011.

<sup>5</sup> Winternitz *Poal Asiatic Society Catalogue* p 216.

<sup>6</sup> *Catalogue* No 1014. Deussen *Sech Upanishads*, p 13 is incorrect as to Sankara's view.



special title of *Saṃhitā Upaniṣad* which is given to it in Śaṅkara's commentary and which it claims for itself by its opening words. The term *Mahaitareya* may have been applied at an early date since it appears to have given rise to the fiction of a *Rṣi*, *Mahaitareya*, by the date of the composition of *Aśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra*, III, 4 but the text of these *Sūtras* is not very certain.

It must be recognized that the interpretation of these *Upaniṣads* is far from certain or easy. They were no doubt originally accompanied in the Vedic schools by explanations which might, had they been preserved, have shown how much we now misinterpret them. But it is impossible to regard Śaṅkara's explanations as traditional. There must have been somewhere a gap in the tradition. This is shown clearly by the fact that Śaṅkara explains all the *Upaniṣads* as exhibiting one doctrine, an impossible view, and that *Baḍarayana*<sup>1</sup> who in his *Brahmasūtra* does precisely the same thing adopted a different doctrine as the fundamental key to the system. All that can now be done is to take the *Upaniṣads* and endeavour to extract what seems the most natural meaning from the actual words.

In the eyes of Śaṅkara and Śāyana there is no difference in time nor in essential doctrines between the three *Upaniṣads* which they regard as one. (There are three classes of men says Śāyana<sup>2</sup> in the Introduction to Book III, those who desire immediate freedom through the knowledge of Brahman, and accordingly find it by aid of Book II 4-6, those who desire to become free gradually by attaining to the world of *Hiranyagarbha* for whom II 1-3 is intended, and those who care only for prosperity, for whom the third *Aranyaka* serves. In the Introduction to II, 1, 2, he adds that it lays down aids to the concentration of thought in the shape of the performance of certain *upāsanas* or meditations. Such meditation may be of two kinds, *Brahmopāsana*, or *Pratikopāsana*, the former consists in contemplation of Brahman as endowed with qualities, the latter in considering worldly objects as Brahman whether, as in the second Book, they are sacrificial objects or non sacrificial.)

It is undoubtedly the case that the *Upaniṣad*, II, 1-3 is intended in some degree to supersede sacrifice or rather while assuming sacrifice to

<sup>1</sup> See Thibaut, *S B E*, XLVIII, 1c th  
I & A S., 1906 pp 40p 59.

*S B E* I, 200. It is true he follows Śaṅkara, but they are not Śaṅkara's actual words.

<sup>2</sup> Śaṅkara, according to Max Müller,

explain it mysteriously the mystic meaning being the essential part. The path *par excellence* is knowledge of the real meaning of the Uktha. Uktha = earth, sky and heaven, its objects are Agni, Vayu and Aditya; its *abits* are food, whereby all is obtained. It is also the body, mouth, nostrils, and forehead of Prajāpati. The breath is Uktha and *sattya* and as *brhati* supports all things. Purusa II, 1, 7, again creates the earth, fire, the sky, the air, heaven and the sun.

In Adhyaya 2, Prāna is identified with the authors of the hymns of the Rgveda, the *res*, the *ardharcas*, and Indra declares himself to be Prana, and, II, 2, 4, the worshipper is identified with the sun.

In Adhyaya 3 the identity of the individual and the Uktha or Prana is insisted upon. The growth of self is traced from the sap of herbs and trees through animals which show hunger and thirst, to knowledge in man and after the identification of Uktha and Prāna the Adhyaya ends with some obscure verses alleged to treat of the winning of Hiranyagarbha.

The precise meaning of the doctrine is hard to decide. It appears however, to amount to a vague pantheism, which recognizes the unity of all existence physical or otherwise, and at the same time tends, as pantheistic views naturally do tend, to become a cosmogonism, especially in the account of the powers of Purusa (II, 1, 7). It is too early yet to speak of a clear differentiation of mind and body, though distinct signs appear in II, 3, 2 where men, animals and trees are regarded as showing in inverse order the growth of intelligence. But the Prana or Purusa does not consist in mind as opposed to body; all things exist in him and both mind and body seem equally essential elements.

Deussen in *Die Philosophie der Upanishad* s<sup>1</sup> argues that the oldest Upanisads are dominated by a doctrine derived from Yajñavalkya which may be styled 'Idealism' and which may be summed up in the propositions (1) the Ātman = the knowing subject within us, (2) the Ātman = itself as subject unknown, (3) the Ātman is the sole reality. These propositions undoubtedly are found in the Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad I-IV, and I agree with Deussen in thinking that they were taken over and partly misunderstood by the Chāndogya Upanisad and that the Taittirīya and Kausītaki Upanisads are probably later still.<sup>2</sup> Nor as

<sup>1</sup> Pp 209 sq., 357, E. T., pp 231 sq., 397 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, pp 23-24. E. T. pp 23-24. The Kausītaki Upanisad, it may be noted,

stands in no organic relation to the Kausītaki Brahmana unlike the Aitareya Upanisad see Lindner, *Kausītaki Brahmana*, p. ix. This goes to prove its later date.

other three doctrines, which naturally lead to the recognition that no such thing as transmigration can exist, and that mere knowledge is freedom and there is no consciousness after death.

The question arises how far these doctrines have any counterpart in II, 1-3. The answer seems that the Upanisad stands in regard to them all on an earlier plane of development. (1) The Ātman is not yet recognized as the unity. That is designated as *Prana* or *Puruṣa*, and in II, 3, 2, the *Puruṣa* has an *Ātman* which is developed in various degrees in the *Puruṣa* according to the diverse forms which *Puruṣa* adopts as man, beast, plant, &c. There is a pantheistic conception, but it is not one of consciousness as the sole reality. (2) There is naturally no trace of the doctrine of the unknowableness of the Ātman. (3) What is more important, there is no trace of the doctrine of the unreality of things. *Puruṣa* exists in them all, but either he is identical with, or creates (II, 1, 7) them, and he does not exist outside them. The nearest approach to a hint of the later idea is found in II, 1, 5, where it is said that if one knows what is *Satya*, then even if falsehood is spoken by him, yet he says what is true. But it is only a vague hint. (4) The doctrine of transmigration cannot be proved to be known to this Upanisad. *Sankara* and *Sayana* of course assume its existence but the passages can be explained otherwise. They are II, 1, 3, *tad idam karma kṛtam ayam puruṣaḥ* which most probably means that action is the man, a man is what he does, not a man is what he did in a former birth, which is not really suitable in the context, and 3, 2, *jathaprajñam lu sambhavaḥ*, which I take to signify 'for their experiences are according to their intelligence, a meaning which avoids dragging in a doctrine by no means needed or even intelligible in the context. The doctrine of the Upanisad is immortality in another world with the gods, II, 2, 4, &c.

There appears therefore no legitimate room for doubt that the Upanisad, II, 1-3, is anterior to the spread of the *Yajñavalkya* doctrine and to all subsequent Upanisads which contain that doctrine. Parts of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and *Chandogya* Upanisads may be equally early, for some of their texts contain no reference to transmigration, but it would seem that *Aitareya Aranyaka* II, 1-3, which forms a unity, is the oldest long Upanisad extant.

In the Upanisad proper, II, 4-6, there is clear evidence of a further development of doctrine. In *Adhyaya* 4 the idea is that the Ātman

produces everything, cosmogonism in fact. In Adhyaya 6 we reach the identifications of Prajāna with Brahman and these two with Ātman. We thus have clearly the doctrine that the Ātman is consciousness, for it is intended evidently not to identify reality with the Ātman, but, as in Adhyaya 4, in a rough way, to show that all things—the gods, the elements, men, animals, &c., are dependent on knowledge that is the Ātman. But there is still no statement that the self is unknowable, that is, the conception of subject as contrasted with object is not yet clear. On the other hand the sole existence of the Ātman appears in II, 4, 3 where it is asserted that there is no other self. But this view carries with it no denial of the reality of things which depend on Ātman. The Mayā conception is not even implicit. Nor is the doctrine of transmigration apparently present. It is true that Śāṅkara and Sayana found it in II, 5 *aitihasyam itara atma kṛtakṛtyo vajogatah praiti sa itah prayann eva punar jayate tad asya tṛtiyam janma*! But *itah* must mean 'hence' and the third birth must be in the heaven, an idea of course familiar to the Brahmanas<sup>1</sup> which know nothing of transmigration.

There is not, therefore, anything in my opinion in this Upanisad to justify us in assigning it to a later date than the period anterior to the main doctrines of the Brhadaranyaka.

In the third Upanisad, III, 1-2 there is little of philosophical interest. There is a repeated identification of the incorporeal conscious self and the sun, and there is a distinct assertion that the self is that which hears, thinks, sees, &c., but is not heard or thought, and which is within all beings. This gives us (1) the conscious Ātman which (2) is not knowable and (3) probably is all that is real. But there is no sign of the doctrine of Maya, nor of transmigration nor of freedom in knowledge. On the contrary the fate of the good is repeatedly stated to be prosperity in this world and Svarga in the next. So even this Upanisad may be earlier than the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad.

External evidence for the dates of the Upanisads is not forthcoming. It is true that the first Upanisad presupposes that the Rgveda was already arranged as we have it at the time when the Upanisad was composed but Oldenberg<sup>2</sup> has shown that the Rgveda assumed its present

<sup>1</sup> Deussen op. cit., pp. 294-295, E. T., pp. 326-327, Macdonell *Vedic Mythology*, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> In his *Prolegomena* and cf. his review of Schelléon's *Les Apocryphes des Évangiles* in *Gott. Gel. Anz.*, 1907, pp.

in II 6, in comparison with the Aitareya account in II 4, 3, is quite inconclusive. Further, the Taittiriya Upanisad<sup>2</sup> sets a high value on asceticism, and thus differs from the Aitareya and even the Bṛhadaranyaka and Chandogya. Historically the earliest view appears to have been opposed to asceticism, which only later was regarded as an aid to knowledge. Again in the Śikṣavallī the knowledge of grammar shown is at least as great as that of the Samhitā Upanisad. Another sign of the comparative lateness of the Taittiriya<sup>3</sup> is the addition of *māhas* to the triad, *dhūr*, *dhruvā* *śar*.

There can, in any case, be no question of the priority of the Aitareya to the Kausitaki Upanisad. The Kausitaki is decidedly late.<sup>4</sup> Adhyaya I is a variant of the transmigration legend found in Chandogya, V, 3-10, and Bṛhadaranyaka, VI, 2, which are both late passages in their Upanisads.<sup>5</sup> The twelve explanations of Balaki Gargya in the Bṛhadaranyaka, II, 1, are expanded to sixteen in Kausitaki IV.<sup>6</sup> The *pranasamvada* of the Aitareya, II, 4, is certainly older than either that of the Bṛhadaranyaka, VI, 11-14, or the Chandogya, V, 1, or the Kausitaki, II, 12-14, III, 3. The name, *udṛiṣṭa* for the organs of sense first occurs in Kausitaki II 15,<sup>7</sup> and in Aitareya III, 2, 1, and the word *manas* occurs in the sense of an organ, like speech, sight, hearing, instead of the old sense 'consciousness,' in Kausitaki, III.<sup>8</sup>

\* Further it may be noted that in the Aitareya, even in III, 2, 3 there is no hint of the recognition of the Atharva as a fourth Veda. Such hints occur in the Bṛhadaranyaka, V, 13 and VI, 4 13, and Atharvāna occurs in Chandogya, VII, 1, 2, while the Atharvans and Angirases are mentioned in the early text, Bṛhadaranyaka, II, 4 10.

Other Upanisads, including the Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, may fairly be left out of account. None of them can claim to be older than the Aitareya and many must be much more modern. They are marked by a greater formalism of doctrine, accompanied by attempts to graft popular doctrines on to the philosophical conceptions of the Upanisads, which were apparently soon found too abstruse for the comprehension of their successors.

<sup>1</sup> 15

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., pp. 64, 65, E. T., pp. 67-69

<sup>3</sup> Cf. supra, p. 42, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Deussen, op. cit., pp. 296-97, E. T.,

pp. 334-34

<sup>5</sup> *Ith I*, p. 80, E. T., p. 87

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 244, E. T., p. 270.

<sup>7</sup> *Ith I*, p. 245, E. T., p. 272

It may therefore be concluded that the first two Upanisads certainly, and probably also the third, precede the Brhadaranyaka and Chândogya Upanisads in their main portions, especially the Yājñavalkya section of the former, that they are pre-Buddhistic, as is proved both by the contents and the language,<sup>1</sup> and that they date from about 700-500 B.C.

In connexion with the relation of the Upanisads to Buddhism it may be well to trace the history of the Ātman doctrine. The derivation of the word is in dispute<sup>2</sup> and throws no clear light on the meaning. But at any rate, it is certain that the Indians obtained gradually, doubtless through the phenomena of dreams and swoons and death, the conception of the body being animated by a soul. This conception naturally reacted on their views of religion. It is impossible to suppose, as is now so often done, that the earliest or even an early form of religion was the belief in spirits which take up their abode from time to time in various forms. It cannot have been until after long experience that the idea of a disembodied spirit can have been intelligible. Primitive man must long have regarded body and mind as one. So his earliest worship must have been addressed to things which seemed to him to be able to help or hurt him. We cannot believe with Rhys Davids<sup>3</sup> that the early worship of trees was really dryad worship. The early believer regarded certain trees as divine, just as he regarded certain animals, like the cow or the snake, as divine because of their beneficent or maleficent powers, and it was only later that the idea of the spirit as separable from the tree or animal appears. Once the idea of a separate spirit is arrived at of course the nature of the deity changes, anthropomorphism arises, or other animals or things than that which the deity originally was become his place of abode<sup>4</sup>. Further, other abstract deities can arise, and we pass from worship of natural objects to worship of spirits embodied from time to time in natural forms. It was not unnatural that the thinker should endeavour to find some common explanation of the vast world of souls, and still less unnatural that he should decide that all souls were identical,

<sup>1</sup> Liebhich, *Panini*, ch. 10, concludes that the language of the Brhadaranyaka is pre-Paninian. This incidentally supports the theory of the date of the Aitareya.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie d's Veda*, p. 285; Geldner, *Verfälschte Studien*, III, 116.

<sup>3</sup> *Buddhist India*, p. 226. Cf. Oldenberg's view of early religion, *Religion des Veda*, p. 37.

<sup>4</sup> Hence the fetishism described in Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp. 44-47, and cf. my article, *J. R. A. S.* 1907, pp. 929-949, on theomorphic deities.

■ subject, and it is no answer that there need be no permanent individual self

The doctrine of *anatta* therefore destroys all the basis of *samsāra*, and ■ complete proof that Buddhism is entirely dependent on the Upanisads which first clearly develop that view. There are numerous other signs of dependence. The dialogue form is copied from the dialogues of the Bṛhadaranyaka and Chandogya, and even the style of the Aitareya Upanisad, II 6 *3 ad etad hrdayam manas castat samjñanam ajñanam vijñanam prajñanam madha distir dhrtir matir manīṣa juteḥ smrtih samkalpah kratur asuh kamo vasa iti sarvaṇy evaṣṇani prajñanasya nama dhīyānu*, is a forecast of those intolerable lists of practically meaningless synonyms which disfigure the pages of the Pali Suttas. In estimating the causes of the fall of Buddhism,<sup>1</sup> it must, I think, be recognized how great a part was played by the unphilosophical and uncritical nature of the metaphysical doctrine, and by the elaborate mass of inaccurate and fanciful psychology,<sup>2</sup> which the school endeavoured to set up as its contribution to the knowledge of truth. The Upanisads contain much that is foolish and meaningless, but they are the first books of a new faith and were fated to be the sources of a system of philosophy whose influence in India is still paramount.

It follows with certainty that the Aitareya Upanisads are considerably older than Buddha, whose date of death is certainly about 487 or 477 B C.<sup>3</sup> We must therefore probably fix 600 B C as the lowest limit for their composition, or put 550 B C at the very latest thus modifying slightly the results above reached. It is not possible to estimate how quickly thought then worked, but about 50 to 100 years will be required for the development from the earliest to the latest Upanisad, and I incline to fix approximately the dates at from about 700-600 B C for Aranyaka II, and 550 for Aranyaka III. Aranyaka I may be somewhat earlier, but not necessarily much earlier, while, as seen above, the Āranyakas IV and V belong to about 450 B C, thus explaining the dictum of Sayana which distinguishes so sharply between the two parts. The upper date may

<sup>1</sup> Cf Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp 319-320

<sup>2</sup> Mrs Rhys Davids in her *Buddhist Psychology* has done much for the study, but the fact remains that it is not worthy

of the labour bestowed on it. Cf Hopkins, *J R A S*, 1906, p 581, Louis de la Vallée Poussin *J R A S* 1906, p 944

<sup>3</sup> Cf p 37, n 5

from the Samkhya may be yet it is clear that it was from the Samkhya that Buddhism derived its theory of the soulless entity which yet goes through transmigration. For this is precisely the *lingasārī* which alone migrates, *purusa* being a truth utterly dissociated from matter. From this point of view also is reached the result that the Aitareya is considerably anterior to Buddhism.

Aranyaka I contains, in comparison with the Upanisads, little of philosophic interest. It is important, however, to observe that in it *brahman* appears already as a principle of unity. In I, 1, 3 *gajatri* is identified with *brahman* and the Mahavrata day is also identified, because it leads to *brahman*. Similarly *Vasukra* is *brahman* and so is identified with the Mahavrata day. There can be no doubt that the *brahman* conception is older than that of the Atman, and that it originally meant the power of prayer, which even in the Rgveda is treated as a spell to bend the gods by its own force to grant what is craved, instead of being considered an appeal to the lovingkindness of the gods. That eventually this doctrine was amalgamated with a younger rival, the Atman doctrine, as Oldenberg suggests seems to me undoubted. The assimilation is seen complete in the Upanisad II 6 which indicates the length of time which we must assume between the first book and the Upanisad proper.

It remains to consider whether any explanation can be given of the connexion with the doctrines of the Upanisad of the Mahavrata rite. Some light on this matter is thrown by Prof Eggeling in the introduction to Part IV<sup>1</sup> of his translation of the Satapatha Brahmana. He there points out that the Agnicayana and the Mahavrata appear to have been developed in connexion with a doctrine of the production of the world from the sacrifice of Purusa (cf Rgveda, X, 90) which eventually yields the equation of Prajāpati at once to the sacrifice and the sacrificer (cf Aitareya Aranyaka, II, 1, 2). But the sacrifice lasts a year and so Prajāpati becomes time and death, and eventually mind. Thus the Mahavrata rite is treated in the Aranyaka as specially secret and finds a natural development in the more purely philosophic Upanisads.

In conclusion, a few words may be said as to the relation of Aranyaka III to the other Vedic texts of similar content. It is of course very closely related to the Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka VII, VIII, with which it agrees verbally in some parts, showing that both versions go back to

<sup>1</sup> S B E, XLIII xi : xxvii



■ not very distant common ancestor. But on the whole the version of the Śāṅkhāyana seems the more modern in several respects<sup>1</sup>

The Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa ■ certainly a much more recent work. Burnell, in the preface to his edition, has urged general considerations for its comparatively late date. It shows a considerable advance of phonetic science, and mentions such points as *lopa*, *atikhara*, *rephasandhi*, and *visargopagraha*, while it deals with the *śvaras*. Three sorts of Samhita are distinguished, the *deva*, *asura*, and *ṛṣi*, an artificial conception. The Samhitā ■ also considered as *juddha*, *aduhṣṛṣṭa*, and *anirbhīṣṭa*. In the last section philosophy has degenerated into meaningless formulae, and the demand for gifts in Section IV is beneath the dignity of the older Aranyakas and Upanisads. Nor is it without significance that in so short a text are found *sukhubhavaṭi* and *gulmibhuta*, forms rare indeed in the older texts<sup>2</sup> while the only narrative tense found is the perfect<sup>3</sup> (in III) and the language is classical.

The Āranyaka III is also in all probability older than Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 3, which appears, as will be seen from the note on III, 1, 2, to be an enlarged version of the older Samhita doctrine, although it seems likely that the Upaniṣad is much older than the Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

## VI Style and Grammar

In this connexion it will be sufficient to consider the first three Aranyakas as forming one whole as distinct from the fifth Aranyaka, and to disregard the differences in date among their parts. The quotations contained in the fourth Āranyaka, and also scattered throughout the rest of the work, may be left out of consideration until later (p. 74).

The prose of the Aranyaka is of considerable historic interest. The history of Sanskrit prose is one of continual degradation so far as the grammatical structure of the language is concerned. Classical prose, whatever the subject matter, whether romance, ■ in Subandhu and Bana,

<sup>1</sup> I have had available for comparison the MS. Sansk. ■ 2 of the Bodleian Library, described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue* pp. 39, 60, and, as I fear Dr. Friedländer will not carry out his projected edit. on, I have not refrained

from quotation from the text.

<sup>2</sup> Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1093, 1094.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxxi, n. 2.

clauses takes the place of due subordination, and an inordinate love for parallelism of structure is the chief sign of conscious literary effort (cf II, 1, 4, 4, 3). There is no power of transition from thought to thought, and in other cases it is difficult to tell whether it is the thought which is defective or the language which has failed to express it (cf e.g. II, 1, 2 *na tasjete jan nadyad jad rannam nadynti*, II 1, 5 *na tasjete jan mahyam na dadynti*). Some defects it shares with all Sanskrit prose. Although it has at command a considerable range of particles it fails to use them with any clear discrimination of sense, thus contrasting with the analogous phenomena in Greek literature where a delicate discrimination in the use of particles runs on from Homeric into classical Greek. Again, although it commands a wide range of pronominal forms they are not used with any clear difference of sense, and indeed a characteristic of the *Āitareya*, as of all Brahmana prose, is the use of double pronouns, like *sa esa*, without the slightest real difference of sense from the single pronouns. The same result, lack of precision, arises from the free use of the cases of the noun and the absence of prepositions to define exactly the sense intended.

But utterly lacking as is the style in precision balance and elegance, and although the *Aranyaka* is destitute of any attempt at ornament, it has nevertheless a certain fitness to its subject matter. The naïve speculations, the vague guessings after truth, the confusion of thought, which make up the matter, are not inadequately mirrored in the harsh abruptness and elliptic brevity of the style and a certain variety is introduced in the frequent quotations of verses intended to bear out the argument.

The historical position of the prose is not open to serious doubt. It cannot be contemporary with the classical prose of the *Kavya* type, and it is clearly anterior to the prose of the *Sūtras*. This is shown not merely by the disuse in the *Sūtras* of various grammatical forms still found in the *Aranyaka* but still more by the form of the *Sūtras*. The *Aranyaka* is written in prose as a literary composition, other *Sūtras* consist merely of strings of rules, and though as Dr Knauer in his edition of the *Gobhīṣya Gṛhya Sūtra*, and Hillebrandt in his edition of the *Sāṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra* have shown they can be construed as texts written continuously, still such compositions must be later than original prose works. On the other hand, not only does the *Aranyaka*

contain fewer grammatical antiquities than the *Āitareya Brahman*, but it is written in a more developed style and with a greater approach to a command over the language.

The style shows also interesting affinities with that of the Buddhist Pāli Sūtras. It is impossible not to recognize in both the same long lists (e.g. II, 6) of names of mental phenomena, in which thought is hidden under meaningless verbal distinctions. Similar in both is the affection for parallelism of structure and the remorseless love of completeness which insists on repeating in every detail ideas applicable to more than one subject in every instance in which they apply, while the set formulae with which the Pāli Sūtras open and close have close parallels in the *Āraṇyaka*.

On the whole the vocabulary of the *Āraṇyaka* shows little that is remarkable, a few Rgvedic words are used with direct reference to the passages in the *Saṃhita* in which they occur. *Vista* is found only in the phrase *visṭe devah* and twice in etymologies, I 2, 2, II, 2 1. *latha tu katha ca* occurs twice, III, 1, 3, 4. Other interesting words are *ajatah* III, 1, 2, from *√jat*, to stretch, *ādam*, III, 1, 2, *addha-taman*, I, 2, 3, *bidale*, III, 1, 2, *batarakani*, III 2, 4, *mañjista*, III, 2, 4, *sambalhatamah* from *√bambh*, I, 4, 1, *bisani*, III 2, 4, and *brśih*, I, 2, 4, where the dental *s* is remarkable, *dutah*, I, 4 1, which is taken by Sayana from *√du gatau*, *ulbanisnn*, II, 3, 8, *atajat*, II, 4, 3 which is usually derived from *√av*, meaning 'devour', *sutani*, I, 2, 2, *ṛstapam*, II, 1, 2, *vikṣudram* I 5 1, *vija.ah*, of doubtful number, I, 4 1, *sattjam* for *satjam*, II 1, 5, *samanodarkam*, I 5, 3, *stomatīsamsanayai*, I, 4, 1, *antastjam*, I, 5, 1, *ksudramśram* II, 6, *udbhijani* II, 6, &c.

Throughout between vowels *d* and *dh* are written *f* and *lh*. This is carefully observed in the best MSS and has been followed consistently. In II, 4, 3 *saṁso* is supported by the MSS, and in III, 2 4 *majura-grī.ameghe* seems to stand for *majūnagrīva(h) ameghe*, and cf *acostha-īarabhyam*, III, 1, 3. *Namo astu* is the form in the MSS in III, 1 3, 4, and they read in III, 1, 2 *tasmin ha svam*. Irregular lengthening of vowels appears in *itu nu*, III, 1, 2, and *ṛtjyā*, II, 3 8, in the latter case in a verse. The sandhi of *au* is peculiar, it becomes *av* before all vowels except *u* or *u*, when it becomes *u*. The same rule is usually followed in the *Āitareya* and other Brahmanas (Aufrecht's ed., p. 427).

In noun and adjective declension there are few irregularities. *Ātman*,

I, 5, 2, occurs besides *atmani*, II, 5, *śiṣṭan*, I, 5, 2, also ■ found *Aksobhyam*, II, 4, 1 (cf Rgveda, X, 163) shows irregular lengthening of the vowel *Āpah*, II, 4, 1, appears to be an accusative as not seldom elsewhere *Aikya*, III, 2, 3, is perhaps a neuter instrumental. The genitive singular of nouns and adjectives and pronouns which show *ah* in the Rgveda and in the later language have *ai* as usual in the Brāhmanas. The only exceptions appear to be *prthivyah* II 1, 7, III, 1, 2, *aiyah* and *amuyah*, III, 1, 2, 2, 5. In the ablative is found *brhatyāi* II, 3, 6, *asyai pratisthayaḥ*, I, 2, 4, of superlatives *brahmatatamam* II, 4, 3 for *brahmatatatamam*, and *annatamam pratijacante*, I, 4, 1, are remarkable. *Catuspadaḥ* and *catuspatsu* occur in I, 1, 2, with ■ v l *catuspadaḥ*. *Navasrakṣ* in II, 3, 6, anomalously appears to stand for *navasrakṣuk*. *Enat* in II, 4, 3 is apparently a nominative as in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII 22, and if so *paran* is used as a neuter *Nabhyai* with the longer form occurs in II 4 1, in the ablative. *Enam* is used almost as an adjective, III, 1, 3. *Imasmas* occurs in II, 3, 7.

The numerals show certain interesting forms. *Ekayā na trimsat* occurs in I, 1, 2. Besides *sapta satam vimśatis ca*, III, 2, 1, appears *sapta vimśatisatam* III 2, 1, so also *trini santisatam* (= 360), III 2, 1, and *pañca catvarimśatsatam* (= 540), III, 2, 2 as usual in the Brāhmanas. The form *ṣaṭtrimsatam sahasram*, II, 2, 4, 3, 8, denotes 36,000, and may be considered, perhaps like *ṣaṭtrimsatam ekapadaḥ* Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 1, as an irregular use of accusative for nominative, cf *pañcavimsatam samudhanyah*, V, 1, 1.

Among verbal forms may be noted the Vedic forms, *duḥe*, I, 3, 2, and *ise*, II, 1, 2, 5, as third persons, both these forms occur in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. As in that Brāhmaṇa unaugmented forms occur in *śhata*, II, 4, 1, 3, and *padī*, II, 1, 2. *Upanisāsasada* in II, 2, 3 is supported by all the MSS. *Abhivyañjyat* in II, 4, 3 appears, if the reading is correct, to be the aorist of *abhivyañjya* with the *ts* augmented. *Atrapjāt* and the irregular *agrahanyāt*, II, 4, 3, are examples of the rare conditional. The perfects *dādāra*, I, 5, 2, II, 1, 7, and *bibhāja*, I, 3, 4, occur also in the Brāhmaṇa. *Dadrśe*, II, 1, 3, 8, and *menē*, III, 1, 1, are, the former certainly, the latter probably passive. The *√kr* alone is used as an auxiliary in the periphrastic perfect viz *upāsām cakṛe*, II, 1, 8, and *vedayām cakṛe*, III, 1, 1. The following desiderative forms occur *ipsati* II, 3, 2, *ipsantah*, I, 1, 1, *vacakṣet*, III, 2, 6,

*ayghrksat*, II, 4, 3, *atyayghamsat* II, 4, 3, *abhutvtsat*, I, 3, 1, *bibhatseta*, II, 3, 7, *munamisante*, III, 2, 3, *viruruciseta*, III, 2, 5, and the rare aorist *samadhitsisam* III, 2, 5 which is a distinct sign of antiquity. The only intensives are *popluyante*, *sarsrpyante*, I, 3, 5, and probably the form *vavadisat*, II, 4, 3, which I take as an aorist subjunctive, also an old form. The denominative *pateyasi* occurs in I, 3, 5. For the infinitive and subjunctive forms see below. There are no irregularities in the use of *\*iva* and *\*ya* such irregularities being characteristic especially in the case of *\*ya* of epic style, not of the Vedic style. The gerund in *am* appears in *pranavam* and *chandaskaram*, I, 5, 1. It may be noted that in II, 1, 4, *smah* is substituted for *smasi* of the quotation. *Attam*, II, 3, 6, and *apiksta*, III, 2, 5 may also be mentioned.

Very characteristic of the early date of the Aranyaka is the separation of prefixes and their verbs. It is not normal, the great majority of prefixes are placed immediately before the verb, and I have accordingly printed them as forming compounds. But the older tradition survives in the following cases: *ati manyeta*, II, 3, 3, *anu yujate*, II, 3, 8 (in a verse), *abhi samvakanti*, *ibid*, *a gachati*, *gachatah gachanti* I, 1, 4, *a jayate*, II, 3, 1, *abhi irnatti* I, 3, 1, *para bhavati* II, 1, 4, &c, *adhi caranti*, *bhavati jayate* II, 3, 1.

Pluti and the consequent lengthening of the vowels concerned occurs sporadically. The MSS differ considerably, like the editions in noting the Pluti, and it has as a rule been considered proper to insert it in the text only where Sāyana mentions its presence.

In regard to syntax it may be noted that the rules of concord are usually carefully followed as in all old works. In II, 1, 7, examples will be found of a masculine and a feminine singular, and a masculine and a neuter singular, being accompanied by a verb in the dual, and a plural masculine accompanies a feminine plural and a masculine singular. *Andam* in III, 1, 2, is unusual, as *andah* would be expected, but cf *sarvam atati*, I, 5, 2, *samanam atitayah*, II, 1, 2. In III, 2, 4, *etesam kimcid* occurs, although *svapnam* is to be understood. The usual attraction to the number and gender of the predicate occurs in I, 4, 1 *athato vyavas ta virajo bhavanti*, II, 6, 1, &c. The plural in *adyuh*, II, 1, 2, and *dadyuh*, II, 1, 5, offers difficulties.

In the use of the pronouns there is little of note. The forms of the base *enad* occur frequently, but as in all the Brahmanas the pronouns

are used in a very confusing and inaccurate way. Double pronouns are very common e.g. *sa eṣaḥ*, II, 1, 5, 8, 3, 3, 6, 4, 3, III, 1, 1, 2, 4, &c., *saiśa*, II, 3, 6, 4, 3, III, 1, 6, *tad etad* II, 1, 2, 3, 6, 4, 3, *taśyatasya*, (neut.) II, 2, 4, III, 2, 1, (masc.) III, 2, 1, 3, *tasya etasya* (gen.) III, 2, 6, *ta etah*, II, 1, 4, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 2, *etad tad*, II, 1, 8, *taṁ imam*, I, 1, 2, *tad idam*, II, 1, 2, *ta imah*, II, 1, 1, *taṁ imam*, II, 1, 1, *so 'yam*, II, 5, 1, *soyam*, II, 1, 2, *tasya me*, II, 2, 3, *ja eṣaḥ* II, 2, 1, *jo 'yam* III, 2, 3 &c. *Ya* forms numerous indefinite combinations which are given in the Index, *s v*. The usual correlations are *ja* and *sa*, e.g. *je te*, II, 1, 1, &c., *jad tad*, II, 3, 6, &c. More unusual are *tad etad jad etad*, II, 1, 2, *jad etad-tad etad*, II, 5, 1, *etad jad etad*, II, 3, 6, *jad etad tad* II, 3, 7. In one case it is uncertain whether a relative *m* not omitted, viz. II, 5 *ko 'yam atumeti vajam upasmanāḥ*, where *jam* may be read.

In case construction there is the usual freedom. The accusative denotes duration of time in *śatam varṣam*, II, 2, 1, *samvatsaram ga rakṣayate*, III, 1, 6, where the use of the historic present *m* to be noted, *ahoratre varṣati*, III, 1, 2, where the meaning *m* 'day and night continuously'. The cognate accusative appears in *aśyam ayan*, II, 1, 1, and *kakakulayagandhikam vjayati* III, 2, 4. Other uses are *sartam madhyato dadhe*, II, 2, 1, *enave atikṣaranti* II, 2, 2, *jyotiḥ prakāśam karoti*, II, 1, 8, *akāśaṁ samet* III, 2, 4. More unusual is the use of the accusative as if in apposition to the main sentence as in *irjātam cābhyuṣṭhanam ca*, I, 5, 1. The instrumental *m* used with *√stu* *mahāvratena stutita*, III, 2, 4. The dative is used with *√arc* *sarvebhyo bhutebhyo 'rcata*, II, 2, 2, and *sarvebhyo rdhebhya 'rcata*, *ibid* which *m* probably an extension of the usual *datus commodi* found in the same passage with *kṣarati*. The date of 'work contemplated' appears in *punjabhyah karmabhyah pratidhuyate*, II, 5. Other datives used predicatively are practically equivalent to infinitives, see below. In *sarvebhyo bhutebhyo dadṛśe*, II, 1, 3, 8, the case may be dative or ablative. The ablative follows *anyat* in *anyat kuśalāḥ brahmanam brujāt* III, 1, 3 (cf. I, 1, 2) when the double accusative is interesting. In III, 2, 4, *atmana et iśya tat kṛtam bhāṣati* *atmana* may stand for *atmanak*, a predicative genitive, or for *atmane*, *m datus commodi*, the former view is supported by V, 3, 3, *atmano kṛtasya tac chāstam bhāṣati*. In either case *iśya* is to be taken probably directly with *kṛtam* and *śastam*, cf. *nak prakṛtam*, III, 2, 1, *iśya uditam*, II, 1, 5. Worthwhile of note is the construction in

Āranyaka I, 6, there occur—is usually in the rest of the Āranyaka—perfects, *upajaganta* (cf *upajaya*) *uāca*, and *uce*. There must be a common source for the two narratives despite the difference of their present forms, and it must have used perfects in narrative. Besides these narrative perfects, perfects in the present sense occur in *dadhara*, II 1, 7, *dadrse* II, 1, 3, 8, both of which are conjoined with present tenses.

In Aranyaka II, 4-6, occur sixty-one examples of the imperfect from twenty-three forms of nineteen roots (*asit*, *arjata*, *iksata* (5), *amurchayat*, *atapāt* (2), *abhidya* (5), *abhidyetām* (3) *apatam*, *arjat*, *abravīt* (2), *abrutam*, *abruvan* (4), *anajat* (3), *aviśat* (5), *avisan* (3), *ajujata* (2), *ajighāmsat*, *ajighīksat* (8), *aśaknot* (7), *avayat*, *apadyata*, *apaśyat*, *abhavat* (2). The only narrative perfect is *uāca*, II, 5, and there is one present perfect, *dadhe*, II, 2, 1.

In Aranyaka III occur *asramsata* and *adadhat* (2), III, 1, 6, and the present perfects, *mene*, III, 1, 1, *viduh*, III, 2, 5.

The two periphrastic perfects *upasam cakrīre*, II, 1, 8, and *vedajam cakre*, III, 1, 1, may both be narrative perfects, but the latter may be a present perfect.

The results may be tabulated as follows, omitting periphrastic forms, the Ślokas in II, 3, 8, are not taken into account. The numbers in brackets denote the number of roots.

Āranyaka	Imperfects.	Present Perfects	Narrative Perfects
I,	7 (5)	3 (3)	3 (2, <i>asa</i> and <i>uvajaca</i> (1))
II, 1, 2, 1-2, 3	67 (19)	2 (2)	3 (1, <i>babhuvā</i> )
II, 2, 3-4	None	None	17 (6)
II, 4-6	61 (19)	1 (1)	None

The fair conclusion is that the Aranyaka is older than the later books, VI-VIII, of the Aitareya Brahmana as is indeed probable in view of the much more developed narrative style of the Sunahśepa legend. It is probably older than parts (if not the whole) of the Satapatha Brahmana, viz I-V, X, XII-XIV, including the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, which uses the narrative perfect throughout. In view of the copious and rich style of that Upanisad with its wealth of metaphor, ease of motion, and dignity, it seems impossible to doubt that it belongs to a much later period than the Aitareya just as we have seen that its philosophic content goes far beyond that of the Aitareya. Bearing in mind that the Brhadāranyaka shows considerable evidence of the activity of the Ksatryas, and that

the perfect as a narrative tense is common in the Epic, it may be suggested that the origin of the narrative use in the Brahmanas is to be found in a borrowing from the style of the old Itihāsa literature. It is perhaps not without significance that such legends as that of Śunahśepa, Pururavas and Urvāṣī (Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 5, 1) Cyavana (ibid., IV, 1, 5), and, in the Antareya Aranyaka itself, that of Viśvāmitra, II, 2, 3, should be told in perfects. It may be noted that in the Śāṅkhya Śrauta Sūtra XV, 17 sq., the Śunahśepa legend is also set out in perfects. The Brahmana use of the perfect is as a present, while both usages are found in the earlier language of the Rgveda Samhitā. The older is undoubtedly the Brahmana use as it corresponds most closely with the use of the Greek perfect as a completed action or state (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, p. 31).

The future indicative is used in its ordinary way as denoting future time in assertions or questions, but the so-called second future never occurs, as it does, e.g. in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

The optative is of comparatively very frequent occurrence. (1) Its use as denoting wish is infrequent, the subjunctive usually being preferred, but (2) its use in directions as a mild imperative occurs passim. (3) It is also used in questions to express doubt precisely as is used the subjunctive with which it alternates in II, 4, 3 *katham nu vidam mad rite syat katarena prapadyai*. (4) Its most characteristic use in the Āranyaka is in the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences. In the apodosis it may denote either direction or the potential. In all cases the condition is one referring to the future, and is of the type 'If A happens then B will happen, or should be done.' Examples of two potentials are *jadā atnuvita manyeta*, II, 3, 3, so III, 1, 6, (with *jad* = if) II, 3, 6, III, 2, 2, (with *jatha*) III, 1, 3, 4. Examples of a potential protasis and imperative apodosis are (with *jad*) I, 1, 1, III, 1, 3, 6, 2, 4, 6, (with relatives) I, 2, 2, III, 2, 4, 5, and without any particle *pasyet-dr̥ḥyetaam-vidjās*, III, 2, 4, with double protasis, *upaśruṇyat jadā śruṇyat vidjāt*, III, 2, 4. (5) Arising from this potential use the optative appears as an indefinite, like the Greek subjunctive and optative or the Latin subjunctive. This is possibly the explanation of the difficult phrases in II, 1, 2 *na tasyete jan nādyaḥ jad vanaṃ nādjuh*, II, 1, 5 *na tasyete jan mahyam na dadjuh* though the meaning might be merely a future. Definitely indefinite is III, 2, 1 *jatha śala amse sarie nja amśah*.



*samāhitāḥ syuh*, since the *apodosis* is an assertion of fact (6) An optative of characteristic, that is of result is found in III, 2, 3, *brahmanam kurvita so paśyet*. It will be seen that none of these usages offer any difficulty of explanation on the now generally accepted theory<sup>1</sup> that the optative is originally a weak future in sense.

As in other languages the indicative can be used modally, and in conditional sentences this use is well developed in the *Āranyaka*. In II, 3, 3, *jady antarikṣalokam āsmute 'ty enam manyate* is clearly modal, and is followed by *jady āsmurita manjeta*. So *jatra vishyete vidyat* in III, 2, 4. Hence indicatives are sometimes combined with optatives in protases of conditional sentences, the following occur in III, 2, 4, *jatra drīyate paśyet na paśyet paśyeta vidyat*, *jatra drīyate abhikhyajeta paśyet, vidyat*, *upakṣeta tuḥ jathā drīyante-jada na paśyet, vidyat*, III, 1, 4, *ja upavadet cen manjeta aha brīyat*. The indicative also occurs in conditions where the fact is asserted in the apodosis (with *jady*), e.g. II, 4, 3, or when the protasis and apodosis refer to the future, e.g. *jasmim patyati-bhaviṣyati*, II, 1, 4.

The only case of a condition in the past which was not fulfilled occurs in II, 4, 3 *jad hamad acagrakṣyad abhivyahṛtya karāṇnam atrapsyat*, &c. where the conditional is correctly employed. This accuracy in the use of the conditional and generally in the use of the optative is characteristic of an early date.

The subjunctive is of comparatively frequent occurrence, usually in the first person. It denotes (a) resolve *pratiśama utkrāmanā* II, 1, 4, *syjat*, II, 4, 1, 3, *adama* (in a relative clause), II, 4, 2, (b) desire *asmi*, I, 5, 2, II, 1, 4, 2, 2 *asat*, I, 4, 3, 5, 1, *apūnati* I, 4, 3, 5, 2, *avarunadhāt*, I, 4, 3, *asnavat*, I, 4, 3 (c) doubt in questions *bravasi*, III, 2, 6, *prapadyai* II, 4, 3, *varadisat* II, 4, 3 if this is so taken, (d) with *ne* *ucchidyat* I, 2, 4, *asat*, I, 5, 2.

The imperative occurs several times, but there is no instance of the use of *ma* except in II, 7, 1, which is not genuine, where *ma prahasth* (or *prahasit*) is found. The *Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka*, XI, 6, has *mā* with the future.

The infinitive in *tum* occurs only twice in both cases with the verb

<sup>1</sup> Cf Goodwin *Greek Moods and Tenses* App. A. This would account for the disappearance of one of the tenses in Latin

Tentonic, and Balto-Slavic (Lindsay, *Latin Language* pp. 511-516).

*śak*, *sandhātum nasakāṣi*, III, 1, 4, *asaknot grahītum*, II, 4, 3. This is consistent with the early date of the Aranyaka. On the other hand, as in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa *īkṣara* is construed with the infinitive in *ītoḥ, bhavitoḥ*, II, 3, 5, 6, *caritoḥ*, I, 1, 1, *prastitoḥ*, II, 3, 5. Mention should also be made of a series of datives formed from verbal roots by the affix *ītyaḥ* which serve as predicative datives signifying that to which an active tends viz *kīpīyaḥ*, I, 3, 8, *abhyapīyaḥ*, I, 1, 2, *prajapīyaḥ*, I, 2, 4, 3, 1, 4, 4, 1, *santapīyaḥ*, II, 5, *apīyaḥ*, I, 1, 3, 2, 1, 3, 3, 8, *adhyapīyaḥ*, I, 4, 2, *upapīyaḥ*, I, 3, 7, *acaruddhīyaḥ*, I, 1, 2, &c., *apahapīyaḥ* (probably), I, 2, 2. The use of these forms is not precisely that of infinitives but it is analogous and forms a distinct feature of the style of the Aranyaka. Similar forms occur in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

The injunctive, except in the form of the second person plural imperative occurs only in *arjayan*, I, 5, 2.

In the use of participles the most characteristic feature is their use in place of finite verbs, a use arising from their employment as predicative adjectives. In the following cases the substantive verb is expressed *uktam bhavati*, I, 3, 8, II, 1, 5, 8, III, 2, 4, *udītam bhavati*, II, 1, 5, *viśto 'sini*, II, 2, 3, *vyaptam bhavati*, III, 1, 3, *samahitah syuh*, III, 2, 1, *kṛtam bhavati*, III, 2, 4, *apīṣṭa bhavati*, III, 2, 5, *anusaktā gāt*, I, 5, 2. In all these cases the expression means more than the corresponding form of the finite verb would have conveyed, and denotes a completed action whose results persist in the present. The accurate use of these forms is a distinct sign of early style. The same remark applies to most of the cases of the use without the copula *sikītam*, I, 1, 1, *pratīṣṭhitam*, I, 1, 2, *pratīṣṭhitah*, I, 2, 2, 4, 2, *pratīṣṭhita*, I, 3, 4, *viṣṭak*, *vistak*, I, 3, 8, *avīṣṭak*, *uvīṣṭak*, II, 1, 1, *īṣṭak*, I, 5, 3, II, 1, 4, *channah*, II, 1, 6, *srīṣṭau srīṣṭak*, II, 1, 7, *ātītam*, II, 3, 6, *arītam*, II, 1, 6, *vīṣṭabdhak*, *vīṣṭabdhant*, II, 1, 6, *sītam*, II, 1, 6, *uvīṣṭak*, II, 3, 3, *samahitah*, III, 2, 1, *īṣṭak*, III, 2, 4, *sampareṭak*, III, 2, 4, in these instances the effect persists into the present, and no examples of a use like *drīṣṭa* = 'she was seen' occur. In II, 4, 3 *yadī vacobhīṣṭīṣṭam*, &c., the sense approximates very closely to a mere present passive indicative.

There is no instance of the participle in *īat* formed from the past participle passive, which is so common later. That participle occurs also combined with the participle of *√as* *dūtak satyāḥ*, I, 4, 1, *sīktam sat*, I, 4, 2.

In one case the present participle is combined with the *√as* *tapann asmi*, II, 2, 3 expressing a continuing present. It is used with *√man* in *laknuvan manyeta alaknuvantam manyeta*, III, 1, 4, where the change of case is remarkable. Note also *anudgrhuan sandadhad varsati*, III, 1, 2.

The gerund appears equivalent to a present participle in *himkrtya pratipadyate*, I 3, 1, where the action of the verb and participle are simultaneous (cf. my note on the gerund, *J R A S*, 1907, p. 164).

The gerundive *karanīyam* is used with *√man* in III, 2, 4. Here may be noted the strange form *abhyvāharjan*, III, 1, 6, which has the sense of a future participle and the form of a participle of the *s* aorist. No correction seems probable as *\*hāryan* (cf. Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 846) is impossible.

The use of conjunctive particles is marked by the number of combinations allowed as contrasted with the comparatively barren character of the later language. In most of them *ha* plays some part. Examples are *ha vai*, I, 2, 1, &c., II, 1, 2 &c., III, 1, 2, &c., *na ha vai*, I, 2, 1, 5, 2, III, 2, 2, *u haiva*, I 3, 8, II, 2, 4, *evam u haiva*, I, 3, 4, 8, *atho ha vai*, I, 4, 2, *haiva* I 5, 2, II, 1, 4, 8, 3, 7, 4, 3, *u ha sma*, I, 1, 1, &c., *evam u ha sma*, III, 1, 2, *ha sma vai*, I, 1, 3, II, 1, 5, 8, 2, 4, III, 2, 5, 6, *ha sma*, II, 3, 5, 7, III 1, 3, 2, 1, *ha tu*, II, 3, 5, *atha ha*, III, 1, 1, 5, *u ha u*, I, 3, 3, *athapi*, III, 2, 4, *atha khalu*, III, 1, 5, 2, 5, *athatah* I, 4, 1, &c., *atho*, I, 1, 2, &c., *u khalu*, III, 1, 6, *u eva*, II, 1, 1, 2, 1, III, 1, 3, *tv eva* I, 1, 1, 5, 2, II, 1, 4, *tasmad* *hapy etarku*, II, 1, 8, *napu*, III, 1, 2, *akharva* (?), II, 1, 2.

Of single conjunctions the use of *ca* is most important. The regular use is *ca ca*, a formalism distinctly indicative of age, see I, 1, 4, 2, 3, 3, 1, 4, 4, 5, 7, 5, 1, II 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 2, 2, 6, 1, III, 1, 1, 6, 2, 3, and in I, 1, 2, *chandah* is in apposition to *brhatim ca vrajam ca*. A single *ca* is practically restricted to numerals, e.g. *vimśatis ca* II, 3, 6. In I, 2, 2, is found *ca ca ca*, and in II, 6, III, 1, 6 *ca ca ca ca*. In the *Ślokas* in II, 3, 3, appears *śad śar ca śar ca śad u ca*. These facts render the usual division of *vajamsi saṅgavagadhaś cerapadaḥ*, II, 1, 1, into *ca vrapadaḥ* excessively improbable. *Iva* is used frequently (see reff. in Index V) in a sense hardly differing from *eva*, as in also the case in the *Āitareya Brahmana* though it can always be translated 'as it were', merely modifying the literal sense of the verb, cf. I, 1, 2.

*cirāṭaram ita ita agachanti* *Va* has the sense 'indeed' as well as that of 'or', but a single *ita* is more common than a double *ita*, unlike the case of *ca*. *Ita* is used with the subjunctive, II 1, 4, as in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. *Iti* has as usual a large variety of uses, and is never misplaced. *Cana* in III, 1, 3, 4, following *na* appears to have the force of 'even'. *Kamam*, I, 1, 1, III, 2, 4, *śata* II, 2, 2, 4, 2, and *vata*, I, 3, 4, &c., also occur. *Aha* is contrasted with *u* in II, 3, 7.

The same relative wealth is seen in the case of correlative particles. The most common form is *jad tad*, denoting time or cause, or comparison, I 1, 1, 3, 1, II 1, 4, 2, 2, 5, 1, III, 1, 3, variants are *jat tana*, III 2, 6, *jat tasmāt*, II, 1, 6, 2, 1, 2, 3, 6, III 2, 6, more definitely signifying cause. So *yad hi tasmāt*, II, 1, 3. A characteristic and frequent type of sentence is I, 1, 3, *tad yau madhuchandasam śamśati sarasam kumānam avaruddhāi*, cf I 2, 2, &c. *Yatha* is usually balanced by *evam*, II, 1, 6, 3, 5, III, 1, 2, 2, 1, 5, it stands alone in *yathāndam*, II, 4, 1, *yatha śam angam*, II, 5, 1. It is balanced by *tathā* in *yathā prithivī tathā* &c., in II, 1, 2. In I, 3, 1, is *yatha vai evam*. *Yatra* either has no correlative, as in III, 2, 4, or is balanced by *tad*, II, 1, 8, *tad utapti*, III, 1, 2, *tadā*, III, 1, 6. *Yada* is balanced by *attha*, II, 5, *yad hi* by *hauva* II, 1, 5, *yad ha* by *hauva*, II 4, 3. In III, 1, 3, 4, occurs the phrase *yathā hi katha ca bruyād abhyāsam ita jat tathā śāt*, where the words *abhyāsam eva jat tathā* practically form a compound adverb.

Finally it may be mentioned that the grammatical terms *yojan* and *evjan* are used for feminine and masculine, I, 2, 4, 8 in *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VI, 2.

A comparison of the forms and usages cited above with the valuable list of similar forms in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* given by Aufrecht<sup>1</sup> shows conclusively that the *Aranyaka* stands on nearly the same footing as the first five books of the *Brāhmaṇa*. It is not so old, e.g. it has fewer forms of the subjunctive, no infinitives in *-e* or *-ak* or *-tas*, and none in *tok* after *d* or *pura*, but it is not much younger. The use of the narrative tenses is some argument for its being older than Books VI–VIII, to which otherwise it stands close in point of language, though it is much less developed in style.

<sup>1</sup> *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, pp. 427–431.

The conclusion arrived at above on grounds of doctrine that the Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka I, II, is later than the Aitareya Āranyaka I-III, is confirmed by the linguistic tests. Generally the two works correspond most closely in vocabulary, and confirm the view that they must be derived ultimately from a common source. For example, Dr Friedlander well explains *atikaran* in Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, I, 7, as 'laying across', as it means in Aitareya Aranyaka, V, 1, 4, and not, as explained by the commentator on the Śrauta Sūtra, in the sense 'withdrawing'. Probably the common source of the two Aranyakas had the word which has survived only in the Sūtra part of the Aitareya, but in both the Sūtra and Āranyaka of the Śāṅkhāyanas. With the forms quoted above may be compared the irregular sandhi *niṣ tad*, I, 8, the noun and adjective forms, *ātman*, I, 8, II, 1, *etasyaḥ devatayaḥ* (gen.), I, 8, *adhitarāṇi*, I, 7; *udjatatarah*, I, 7, the datives of end served, *bhogyaya*, I, 8, *santyaḥ*, I, 4, *bhūṣajjayaḥ*, I, 4, *avāptyaḥ*, *āptyaḥ*, I, 2, II, 6, the constructions *īśvarah naparajetoḥ*, I, 8, *gamṣyanti bhavati*, I, 8, *upāptā asan*, I, 6; *śamsyate*, I, 5 (cf *śamsyantam*, Aitareya, II, 2, 3), *yathā parivyayedhatte*, II, 16, 1 ad fin, the use of the particles *n vai*, I, 1, 3, *na ha vai*, I, 8, *ha vai*, I, 5, 7, *tathā ha*, II, 1, 11 *ha*, I, 6, II, 10, the construction of the sentence with *tad yad*, II, 10, the irregular numeral *sapta vimśatisatam*, II, 10. As has been seen above the narrative perfect occurs in II, 6, the parallel passage to Aitareya, II, 2, 3, and it occurs also in II, 17 (*provaca*, *jijīṣa*), which may be compared with II, 2, 4, as far as the *provaca* is concerned. Whereas however, the perfects in the Aitareya are marked exceptions, there is no other narrative tense in Śāṅkhāyana. Further, the language of the Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka is much more accurate and modern than that of the Aitareya. Instead of *ṣaṭtrimśatam sahasraṇi* the correct *sattrimśat* is found, II, 17, there are no subjunctives other than those of the first person, which occur with *ned*, I, 1, as in the Aitareya, there are no irregular forms either of nouns pronouns or verbs, save those mentioned above, the aorist is only represented by *avocant* in I, 6. *Ca* is used in *śastrena ca vratacaraya*, I, 6, in a way not paralleled in the Aitareya and in that chapter occurs the form *viṣyūṣaṇ eva cakre*, a periphrastic perfect of the desiderative, a form elsewhere practically confined to the Śatapatha Brahmana. After making full allowance for the difference of length, the posteriority of the Śāṅkhayana is almost certain. If, as seems probable,

*brahma*<sup>1</sup> and *brahman* in I, 5, 6, refer to Brahman and his wife, who perhaps owes her origin to these passages, then a strong argument is added for the later date of the Sāṅkhayana since the Aitareya does not even certainly know Brahman since the passages in which *brahmā* certainly appears refer to the Brahman priest, and in all the others *brahma* may equally well be read Brahman, however, appears in Aitareya Brahmana, V, 33 : Books VII–XIII of the Sāṅkhayana are still later

**Āraṇyaka V** is written in the regular Sūtra style. It is practically impossible to understand it without a commentary for as usual the rules are condensed into unintelligibility. Characteristic is the weight thrown on single words and phrases, e.g. *ajapaya vṛta*, V, 1, 4, *arṇhakaraṇa*, V, 1, 1, and the frequent use of gerunds, besides the piling up of adjectives and adverbial phrases

In Sandhi it appears that *au* before *u* becomes *a*, although here, as in Āraṇyaka I–III, the MSS and the Anandaśrama edition vary. Unusual forms are *atman*, V, 1, 6, *uttare* (loc), V, 1, 2, *vadatyah* without *u*, V, 1, 1, *arṇharyāḥ*, V, 2, 5, meaning 'to be recited by half verses', *brhatikaram*, V, 1, 6, *gāyatrikaram* V, 3, 1, *trīyazarjam*, V, 1, 6, *sa mutah*, V, 1, 3. Of desideratives occur *jijivīset*, V, 3, 1, *jigamīset*, V, 1, 4, and as amended, a desiderative causal *cakīrtayīset* V, 3, 3. The imperative *prabruṣat* occurs in a direction, in V, 1, 5. The feminine genitive form is *āh*, not *ai*.

More characteristic is the pregnant use of case constructions, when for the sake of brevity everything is made to depend on the mere case relation, e.g. (accusative) *azabrīham preṇkham harejuh*, II, 3, 2, *apra-kampī*, V, 1, 3, in quasi apposition to the sentence, (dative) *nijhetatyaya stuvate*, V, 1, 5, *azahakarmāne jigamīset*, V, 1, 4, (abl) *hotrās caturvīṃsat*, V, 1, 1, (gen) *mahāsvatasya pañcavīṃsatim samudhēyah*, V, 1, 1, where the irregular *pañcavīṃsatim* is also noteworthy, (abl and gen) *caturvīṃsān marutāḥ śyasyatanak*, V, 1, 1, (loc) *dīkṣite rajamānabaddh*, V, 1, 5, *na iatse ca na trīṣṭe* ('in the case of') V, 3, 3, (loc. and instr) *arjasyu cet samamnatāsu rajanena samna stuvīran*, V, 1, 6, cf *bhūjasyu cet stuvīran* V, 3, 2, other uses are the dative after *dhatte* with *sam*, *sam pakṣayoh patanaya*, V, 1, 6, an apposition of whole and part *śakhyā mūladesena*, V, 1, 4, and *abuddham-arya*, V, 3, 2. Very strange is

<sup>1</sup> The form *brāhman* is curious and 'and his wife'. Cf Jaiminīya Upaniṣad the passage may mean 'the Brahman Brāhmana III, 4, 9

*śrīyaṃ gor atvam atman dhatte*, V, 1, 6, where *goś* may be a possessive genitive or a genitive of description

In the verb occur two subjunctives in directions put in the mouth of the sacrificer, *pariṇayatha*, V, 1, 1, *mayatha*, V, 1, 2. In V, 3, 2, purpose is expressed by *yatha na* with *haṃśyaṃ*, a curious but not rare (e.g. in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa) use. The optative occurs in directions frequently, and in both protasis and apodosis of conditions, (a) with potential force in both, e.g. *yātaś-azaperan tāvanti jyīṃset*, V, 3, 1, (b) with imperative force in the apodosis (with *yatra tatra*, and *yatra tu laṃam-tatra*) V, 3, 3, (with *yadi*), V, 1, 4, 3, 3, (with *ced*), V, 1, 6, (with a relative), V, 1, 5. In V, 1, 4, *yada śrāmyet* is probably indefinite, in V, 3, 3, *yady api adhyat na snatako bhavati*, the indicative in the apodosis probably expresses the certainty of the result, in V, 3, 2 the apodosis to *cyaveta ced* is curtailed, so also in V, 2, 1.

With regard to participles *jagarito bhavati*, V, 1, 1, and *upakṛpto bhavati*, V, 1, 3, both denote a past action resulting in a present state. *Upalambhamyah*, V, 1, 1, is a sign of comparatively late date, the earlier form being *upalambhyah*, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka, I, 1. No infinitives occur, but many gerunds, e.g. V, 3, 3, and in all about 36 instances are found. In place of an infinitive there is in V, 3, 2, *vyayai sampresitah*. The past participle passive in *yathetam*, V, 1, 2, 3, is simply the equivalent of a past indicative.

The use of particles is comparatively restricted. There occur the following combinations: *atha ha*, V, 2, 4, *ihava, sho eva*, V, 1, 6, *ha sma*, V, 3, 3, *haiva*, V, 3, 3, *no eva*, V, 3, 3, *iva* is equal to *eva* in V, 3, 2, *aha* occurs in V, 1, 6, *khalu* in V, 1, 6, *kaṃam* in V, 3, 3, *puṇar api* in V, 1, 4. In the case of *ca* the single use is the more common, as compared with Āranyaka I-III, in *na vatte ca na trīye*, V, 3, 3 the *ca* may connect with the previous sentence, or be like *śāstreṇa ca brahmacaryaya* in Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka I, 6. In V, 1, 1, *etaś carvasvakakarar (mantrair) eky madhu ite ca* occurs. In V, 3, 3, *is na cana*.

Among other signs of late date may be reckoned the frequency of the locative absolute, the use of adverbial expressions like *antarvādi*, V, 1, 1, *anuparikramanam*, V, 1, 4, *vyāranaprabhṛti*, V, 1, 1, *anavṛcam*, V, 1, 1, the plural of authorship as found in *nīdarsanayodaharīsyamah*, V, 3, 3, and the use of gerunds like *napitena karayitva*, V, 3, 3.

The same style and diction are found in Āśvalayana's Śrauta Sūtra, which, like Āraṇyaka V, consists of a disconnected string of sentences, which, when consisting of more than a few words, are constructed by heaping adjectives on adjectives, adding adverbial phrases, using gerunds, and piling up cases in different senses. There is no independent evidence to show that there is any great difference in time between the Āraṇyaka V and the Śrauta Sūtra.

There seems no reason to suppose that the Āraṇyaka V is not more ancient than the Sankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XVII, XVIII. Hillebrandt has, indeed, suggested that the Sankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra is older than Āśvalayana, and although the last two Adhyāyas may be of different date from the first sixteen, still they are hardly likely to be later, so that, if Hillebrandt's conclusions are sound, the Sūtra XVII, XVIII, will be older than the Āraṇyaka V. But Hillebrandt's reasons are not convincing.<sup>1</sup> He points out that as Weber has said, parts of the Sūtra are written in the Brāhmaṇa style. This refers mainly to Adhyāyas XV, XVI, which contain *inter alia* the Śunahśepa legend. But even assuming that these books are part of the original Sūtra, it cannot be denied that the version of the legend is in no way original, it is merely the same as that in the Āitareya Brāhmaṇa, and differs so little from it that both versions must be descended from a common source. The part of the Āitareya where it occurs is decidedly later than the first five books. The Brāhmaṇa like style is therefore not to be attributed to Suyājña, the author of the Sūtra. Secondly, he refers to the description of the Āśvamedha and of the Puruṣamedha as signs of early age. But this argument depends greatly for its force on acceptance of the theory that Rgveda, X, 18, 8, can be explained from Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 15 and this view is not now usually accepted.<sup>2</sup> Thirdly, he points out that the Sūtra is not written with the full brevity of the latest Sūtra style. This is true, but the argument is really in favour of the priority of Āraṇyaka V. For that work is written in a style less condensed than that of Suyājña, and certainly less condensed than that of Books XVII, XVIII. Further, it must be admitted that as a Sūtra these books are much superior to the Āraṇyaka V. The ritual directions are far more

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my note, *J R A S.*, 1907, pp. 410-413.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Whitney, *Translation of Athar-*

*veda*, p. 848. Oldenberg, *Gott. Gel. Anz.*, 1907, p. 228, n. 1, see however, Lanman *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 385.



precise and detailed, contrasting with the brevity of the directions in the Aranyaka, which mainly concerns itself with a description of the litanies. In the Sūtra the whole process is gone through methodically while the Āranyaka covers only a part of the field. The style is of the usual Sūtra type, it is not in any marked manner more recent than that of the Āranyaka, but it contains practically no irregular forms. With the forms quoted above from the Aranyaka the following facts may be compared. The Sandhi of *a+r* is *ar*, XVII, 5, 9, 7, 8, of *du+u* is *a*, XVII, 10, 5, 16, 5, while *tasyah* occurs in XVII, 3, 2, as always in Aitareya Aranyaka V, *tasyai* is found XVIII, 2, 4, 19, and *prathamāya, dvitīyāya, uttamāya*, XVIII, 20. In XVII, 3, 12, 15, occur *ghatarīh* and *ghatakarīh*, nominatives with the *s* preserved. The locative is used with *√stu* in XVIII, 2, 2, 22, 7, and extended to *√kr* in *atichandaksu bṛjuh*, XVIII, 22, 9. Adverbial phrases besides *antarvedi* are *prasalavi*, XVII, 14, 16, 15, 4, *antahsadaḥ*, XVII, 4, 3, *nana badhinanti*, XVII, 3, 8, while *jaghanena* is used with the accusative, XVII, 5, 8.

Of verbal forms may be noted *prathagrnatat*, XVII, 14, 3, *prabrutat*, XVII, 14, 4; *vinimsamanah*, I, 7, 3, *paryesyanto bhavanti*, XVII, 4, 8, *bhoksyamana(h) bhavanti, dhaksyanto (bhavanti)*, XVIII, 24, 14, 15, the gerundives *prayanīyah, udayanīyah*, XVIII, 24, 2, *karyam*, XVII, 6, 2, *deyam*, XVIII, 24, 32, the gerunds in *am, punarūdayam*, XVIII, 4, 3, 4, 5, 3, 4, *kakupkaram*, XVIII, 4, 3, 4, 5, 3, 4, *panktisamsam*, XVIII, 6, 4, 14, 4, 17, 5, *gayatrisamsam*, XVIII, 16, 1, and the late simple form *sanisam*, XVIII, 16, 2. Of the uses of the optative that in clauses of purpose with *na* is very frequent, in XVII, 10, 8, *yadi syat mṛite*, it is purely indefinite, in *yadi na vidyeta ya etam dīyam kuryat sa etat kuryat*, XVII, 5, 4, the second optative is one of characteristic 'one who can do'. In XVIII, 24, 15, *yadi dhaksyanto (bhavanti) syat* the protasis is future in fact and the apodosis is equivalent to a mild future. In XVIII, 23, 4, *yadi yajñayajñīyam kuryas tasyoktaḥ stotriyānurūpaḥ*, the real apodosis is suppressed. Of particles may be noticed the use of *api va*, XVIII, 3, 4, and of *yady u va*, XVIII, 7, 17, 23, 5. It may be noted as a sign of more recent date that very few particles occur, *ha* only in XVII, 13, 8, *u ha* in XVIII, 2, 3, 5. In XVII, 9, 7, XVIII, 22, 10, is found the remarkable phrase *iti nu a u Marutvāṇīyam, Vaituvvedam*, in XVII, 1, 5, *athapi*, in XVIII, 20, 6, *atho*.

The results arrived at may be supported by a comparison with a work

of date somewhat later than the *Āranyaka V*, the *Bṛhaddevatā*, which shows a style much more modern, even despite poetic licences than the *Āranyaka I-III*, but which is still in vocabulary an archaic work, coeval in date with the early epic. An interesting list of its irregularities is given by Prof. Macdonell,<sup>1</sup> but they are rather of the epic type, e.g. use of *ṣa* for *ṣun* in the gerund, nominative for accusative, unaugmented pasts, &c. It is significant that (1) no genitives or ablatives for *a*, *i*, *u*, stems in *ai* occur, (2) there are no subjunctive forms other than first person forms, (3) the infinitive in *ṭum* is common and no other form is found, while in *VI*, 37, even *śaptakamah* occurs. Significant also is the use of the narrative tenses. The aorist occurs only in the later narrative use and is rare, being formed only from the roots *ga*, *bhu*, *vac*, *iadh*. The perfect surpasses the imperfect in frequency as a narrative tense, for in some 340 lines of narrative<sup>2</sup> there occur 202 perfects to 150 imperfects, and the proportion elsewhere is not materially different. Further, the periphrastic perfect with *asa* is frequent *kamayam asa*, *VI* 76, *utsadayam asa* *VII*, 53, *śikṣayam asa*, *III*, 84, *bodhayam asa* *VI*, 37, *carayam asa*, *VI* 38, *chandayam asuh*, *VII*, 157, *prasadayam asa*, *VIII*, 3, *kṛtayam asa*, *VI*, 24, *prastapayam asa* *VI*, 13, *darśayam asa*, *V*, 63, while the use of *kr* is very rare, *upamantrayam cakre* *V*, 20. Further, the past participles passive are freely used to denote action either past or present in place of finite verbs and use is made of the new participial form in *rat*, *kṛtarat* occurring in *VI* 41, *VII*, 58, *VIII*, 18, *dr̥stavan*, *V*, 58, *dr̥starat*, *VIII*, 33, *fr̥ṣṭa van*, *V*, 71, *labdharan*, *V*, 66, *hataran*, *VI*, 152 &c. Prefixes are not separated from the verbs with which they are connected. Particles are much restricted in number, and combinations are limited. Mention may also be made of the great development in grammatical doctrine seen not only in the discussion in *I* as to nouns, &c., and in *II*, 93 as to particles, but in the use of such forms as *av* locative of *an* the case termination, *ajoh* from *e*, the sign of the dual *at* the root *ad*, and so on. Indeed it is hard to resist the conclusion that the bulk of the *Āranyaka I-III* must lie before the more systematic treatment of grammatical questions in Yaska's *Nirukta*, and a new support is derived for the giving an early date to these books, since Yaska cannot well be later than 500 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> *Uchādhar* etc. *Uchādhar*.

<sup>2</sup> See the fourth Index to Prof. Macdonell's *Bṛhaddevatā*.

It has been noted that **Book III** presupposes the Padapāṭha of the R̥gveda<sup>1</sup> and also the Kramapāṭha. It is therefore later than Śākalya, the author of the Padapāṭha. This, however, leaves the date undetermined, since Śākalya's date is still uncertain. Geldner<sup>2</sup> has recently argued that he dates from the later Vājasaneyya period, and not as supposed by Oldenberg from the end of the Brāhmana period, and that he was a contemporary of the Aruṇi and Yājñavalkya known from the Brāhmanas. But it is extremely hard to reconcile this with the facts that the Padapāṭha presupposes the Samhitā, that the Samhitā exhibits a text which cannot be reconciled with the statements of the Brāhmana texts<sup>3</sup> as to the number of syllables in word groups, in consequence of the Sandhi carried out in the Samhitā. The evidence, therefore, is certainly in favour of Oldenberg's hypothesis, but it leaves the lower date of Śākalya vague. He is, however, cited by Yāska and older than Śaunaka, so that in all probability he must date not later than 600 B C. The Āranyaka III need not be much later than Śākalya, and if it is, as seems most probable, earlier than Yaska, it may be dated from about 600-550 B C. It may be added that it must be older than the Taittirīya Upaniṣad and the Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII, VIII (see note on III, 1, 2).

These chronological results are admittedly uncertain. They are based on the views that (1) the Āranyaka I-III is older than Buddhism by reason of the undeveloped character of its philosophic content, (2) that these books are older than the Brhaddevatā and Śaunaka, who may be dated about 450-400 B C, and probably older than Yaska, who can hardly be brought down lower than 550-500 B C, (3) that they are older than the developed systems of philosophy whose beginnings are at any rate known to Apastamba, whom Buhler dates in the fourth or fifth centuries B C, and who cannot well, on any view, be later than 300 B C, and that they are older than the Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad, known, it seems, to Gautama, who is older than Apastamba by some generations, (4) that they are older than Pāṇini, Katayana, and Patañjali, who cannot well be dated later than 300, 200, and 100 B C respectively, (5) that

<sup>1</sup> Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, p 380

this view, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, lxx, n 7

<sup>2</sup> *Vedische Studien* III, 144-146. See Schiefelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des R̥gveda*, pp 4, 5, who also supports

<sup>3</sup> Cf Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 49, 50, and note on III, 1, 2

Books I and II date from the later Brahmana<sup>1</sup> period but are probably older than the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, parts of the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad, the Gopatha Brahmana, and the Chandogya Upaniṣad, and so belong to a comparatively early date.

The verses and sentences quoted contain, despite their brevity, a remarkable set of old forms. The Slokas in II, 3, 8, and the prose directions in Āraṇyaka V, are more properly treated as above as part of the main work, with which the latter no doubt coincide in time, while the former are not very much older. Of these forms may be mentioned *tanum*, *taniam* (loc.) but *tanvaḥ* (gen.) in I, 3, 5, *sarvasyaḥ* (gen.) in the verse in III, 2, 5, which is a sign of more recent origin, the compounds *Vāruṇatayutānam*, *prthivyupardm*, *brahmandbhartrkam*, *īarṣṣpari-tram*, V, 3, 2, the forms *arajaḥ* (?), *tujah*, *atv* *vjāluk*, *rdntyam*, *rdnam* (?), *ddhrṣah*, in V, 2, 1. Among verbal forms are the third person singulars *īṣe*, *vide*, IV, 1, the first person *stusē*, IV, 1. The curious forms *vijāse*, *sdmnyase*, *bhuvah*, IV, 1, *duham*, V, 3, 2, the subjunctives *dmuṣamsisah*, *pariat*, IV, 1, *jūjosat*, V, 2, 2, *vibhajatha*, V, 1, 1, the injunctives *vidah* (?), IV, 1, *spṛsat* (?) V, 2, 2, *kartana*, V, 2, 2, and perhaps *dvit*, V, 1, 1, the precatives, *apjāsam*, V, 3, 2, *bhujāsam*, V, 1, 1. Of noun constructions may be noted, *jaja somanam*, V, 3, 2, *īar jayām* *īakṣyantim*, V, 1, 5, *īasañ ann*, IV, 1, *prati īam rjīst*, V, 2, 1. In V, 2, 2, *kartana* seems used instead of a dual, in IV, 1, *bratazahai* needs explanation. In V, 1, 1 occur *antarikṣam* *ivāndpyam* *bhujāsam*, &c., where the predicate adjective follows the gender and number of the nearest noun the object of comparison. The uses of *īam* in that passage, of *maricayah*, and of *īndh* and *sdmujah* in V, 2, 1, are all unusual. The question of the date of the verses in IV, 1, has been dealt with in the note on that passage, and cf *J R A S*, 1907, pp 224 sq., Oldenberg *Gott Gel Anz*, 1907, pp 215 sq.

<sup>1</sup> The Brāhmaṇa parts of the Taittiriya, vimsa Brahmana the Antarejya Brāhmaṇa, Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa, Maṇḍūkya, 1 XXX and possibly the Kauṣṭhika Brāhmaṇa are earlier

# AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA.

## ॥ अथ प्रथमारण्यकम् ॥

### ADHYĀYA 1.

ओम्' ॥ अथ महाव्रतम् । इन्द्रो वै वृचं हत्वा महानभवद्य-  
न्नहानभवत्तन्महाव्रतमभवत्तन्महाव्रतस्य महाव्रतत्वम् । द्वे एत-

<sup>1</sup> In B there precede Adhyāya 1 the following शान्ति verses, incorrectly accented, taken from R<sup>1</sup> मूर्मिमुपसृष्टेदप इडा नम इडा नम अपिभ्यो मन्त्रह्रस्वो मन्त्रपतिभ्यो नमो वो अक्षु देवेभ्यः शिवा नः शक्तमा भव मुमुडोका सरस्वति मा ते व्योम सुवृष्टि । मद्र कर्षेभिः ॥१॥ शन्न इन्द्रापी चक्षु ॥१॥ क्षुपे जनं चक्षु ॥१॥ कया नक्षिच आ-  
तिस्रः स्त्रोना पुंघिषी चक्षु ॥ In B the शान्ति verses appear as Adhyāya 9 in Āranyaka III, at fol 191a ओ । नमस्त्रिषाय । ओ उदितशुक्रियन्धे तद्दहमा-  
त्मनि दधे । अणु मानेतिन्द्रियं मयि ओर्म्मयि यशः । सर्वस्व प्राणस्तबल वृत्तिष्ठाम्यणु मा श्रीवृत्तिष्ठल्लु मा यन्तु देवताः । अदव्यश्चक्षुरिपिरम्मनस्सूर्यो ज्योतिषा श्रेष्ठो दौषि मा मा हिंसीः । तच्चतुर्देवहित शुक्रमुचरत् । पथिम शरदश्यतज्जीविम शरदश्य-  
तम् । अपि इडा नम इडा नम अपिभ्यो मन्त्रह्रस्वो मन्त्रपतिभ्यो नमो वो अक्षु देवेभ्यः । शिवा नश्यन्तमा भव मुमुडोका सरस्वति मा ते व्योमन्तवृष्टि । मद्रङ्कर्षेभिः  
चक्षु । शन्न इन्द्रापी चक्षु । क्षुपे जनं चक्षु । कया नक्षिचः कस्त्वा सत्त्वो मदानाम् ।  
अमो यु यः स्त्रोना पुंघिषी मया सप्रथ इति शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्ति । इत्युमेदे संहितारखे  
तृतीयोऽध्यायः । This Adhyāya is not accented at all in B as would appear from Scheffelowitz's reproduction, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, p 167, the accents being wholly omitted from Khila V, 17, 2, onwards as is correctly stated B p 163 In B occur the same verses as in A and B, but in different order First come the verses which are found in R<sup>1</sup>, the Rgvedic verses (मद्र) I, 89, 8, (श न) VII, 35, 1, (क्षुपे) VI, 49 1, (कया, कस्त्वा, अमो यु) IV, 31, 1-3, (स्त्रोना) I, 22, 15 being quoted in full Then follow the words उदितस् down to शतम् and मद्र नो अपि

स्याह आज्ये कुर्यादिति हैक आहुरेकमिति त्वेव स्थितम् । प्र वो देवायामय इति राद्धिकामः । विशो विशो वो अतिथिमिति ३७

वातय मनः । ओ शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्तिः हरिः ओम् । Instead of सर्वस्य E, S, and the other MSS have सर्वः स, °यित for °पिर, and तम् for तद् A begins like R<sup>1</sup>, but adds गृणु° अक् after कर्णेभिः and सुव्रत after अण. It ends पृथिवी मय ओष्ठापिधाना° यसः । इति पूर्वा । At the end of the fifth Āranyaka it has उदितस्— हिसीः as in B, then तद्गुदेवहित अक् । त्वमपे व्रतपा अक् । वाद्दी मनसि— वक्तारम् (as in Āranyaka II, 7) । भद्र नो अपि वातय मनः । शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः इत्युत्तरशान्तिः ॥ २ ॥ R has, at the end of the fifth Āranyaka, ओ— सद्गृणि as in R<sup>1</sup> Then भद्र कर्णेभिः गृणुयाम देवाः १ इ न इन्द्रापी मवतामवोमिः १ क्षुपे अण सुव्रत नव्यसीभिः १ कया अथिच आ भुवदिति तिष्ठः सोमा पृथिवी मय १ तद्गुदेवहित मुक्तुचरत् १ त्वमपे व्रतपा असि । भद्र नो अपि वातय मनः । ओ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः । ओ वाद्दी मनसि (&c as in II 7) । १ ओ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः । इति शान्तिपाठः । T has before II, 4 (the beginning of the Aitareya Upanisad) ओ वाद्दी मनसि (&c as in II, 7, with महासीत्) ending ओं शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्तिः । Then follows आ अये इया नम इया (&c as in R down to अभी पु शः) ending भद्र नो अपि वातय मन । ओ शान्तिश्चान्तिश्चान्तिः । The verses are given in full In U, at the end of II, 7, are added verses as in A from उदित to जीवेन शरदः शत followed by त्वमपे व्रतपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा । त्व यक्षीष्वीडः । ओ शान्ति शान्तिः शान्तिः । In S the text is as in R with the addition of ओष्ठापिधाना वक्तुषी दक्षीः परिवृता पथिः । सर्वस्य वाच ईशाना वाक् मामिह वाद्येदिति वायस. २ ओ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥ Of III, 2 5 S<sup>2</sup>, however, has as in R, then follows उदितः— शत as in B, then त्वमपे व्रतपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा । त्व यक्षीष्वीडः । इ नो मिच' इ वक्ष्य' इ नो भवत्वयमा । इ न इन्द्रो बृहस्पति' इ नो विष्णुश्चक्रमः । वाद्दी मनसि (&c as in II 7) । S at the end of the fifth Āranyaka has ओ उदितः— ईडः as in S<sup>2</sup> then आवदस्व शकुने मद्रमार्चद तृष्णोमार्सोण' सुमति चिकिदि नः । यदुत्पतन्वर्दसि कर्करियेषा बृहर्ददेम विदर्षे सुवीराः । शतधारमुत्तमधीयमाण विप्रथित पितर वक्तारनाम् । मेळि मर्दन्त पिनीरुपस्ते न रौदसी पिपृत सत्यवाचम् । Then comes वाद्दी &c as in II 7, ending ओ शान्ति शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥ In one MS (क्षचित् पुस्तके) the verse शतधारम् follows II 7, instead of preceding it Both

पुष्टिकामः<sup>२</sup> । पुष्टिर्वै विशः पुष्टिमान्भवतीति । अतिथिमिति  
 पदं भवति नैतत्कुर्यादित्याहुरीश्वरोऽतिथिरेव चरितोः । तदु  
 ह स्माह कुर्यादेव । यो वै भवति यः श्रेष्ठतामंश्नुते न वा अति-  
 थिर्भवति । न वा असन्तमांतिथ्यायाद्वियन्ते । तस्मादु काममे-  
 वैतत्कुर्यात् । स<sup>३</sup> यद्येतत्कुर्यादांगम् वृत्रहन्तममित्येतं तृचं  
 प्रथमं कुर्यात् । एतद्वा अहरीप्सन्तः संवत्सरमांसेते त आग-  
 छन्ति । त एतेऽनुष्टुप्शीर्षाणस्तयस्तृचा भवन्ति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री  
 वागनुष्टुप्ब्रह्मणैव तद्वाचं संधाति । अवोध्यग्निः समिधा  
 जनानामिति कीर्तिकामः । होताजनिष्ट चेतन इति प्रजापशु-  
 कामः ॥१॥

अग्निं नरो दीधितिभिररण्योरित्यन्नाद्यकामः । अग्निर्वै  
 अन्नादः । चिरतरमिव वा इतरेष्वान्येष्वग्निमागच्छन्त्येषेह मुखत  
 एवाग्निमागच्छन्ति मुखतोऽन्नाद्यमश्नुते मुखतः पाप्मानमपघ्नते ।  
 हस्तच्युती जनयन्नेति जातवदेतस्माद्वा अहो यजमानो जायते  
 तस्माज्जातवत् । तानि चत्वारि छन्दांसि भवन्ति चतुष्पादा वै

here and at the beginning the verses in S are accented with one or two exceptions in  
 the case of the verses not in the R̥gveda. There can be no doubt that these verses  
 form no integral part of the *Antareya Āraṇyaka*. Neither B<sup>2</sup>, D, F, G, nor L contains the  
 verses. For शिवा नः see *Atharvaveda*, VII, 68, 3, with Whitney's note तच्चकु<sup>३</sup>  
 is *R̥gveda*, VII, 66, 16. See also *Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, VII, 1, and *Grhya Sūtra*, VI, 4,  
 with Oldenberg's note. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, I, 30, has पुनर्मर्गमेत्विच्छियम् । पुनरायुः  
 पुनर्मर्गः ।

<sup>२</sup> bis in F, G.

<sup>३</sup> श्रेष्ठताम् F, G.

<sup>४</sup> असंमा<sup>३</sup> L.

<sup>५</sup> स यद्येतत्कुर्यात् om. G.

<sup>६</sup> संवत्सररम् G.

<sup>७</sup> जनान् F.

<sup>१</sup> मागच्छति F, G.

पशवः पशूनामवरूढौ । तानि चीणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति वयो वा  
 इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ते<sup>१</sup> डे छन्दसी  
 भवतः प्रतिष्ठाया एव । द्विप्रतिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः पशवो  
 यजमानमेव तद्विप्रतिष्ठं चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति । ताः  
 पराग्वचनेन पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति<sup>२</sup> पञ्चविंशोऽयं पुरुषो दश  
 हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू<sup>३</sup> द्वा वाहू आत्मीय<sup>४</sup>  
 पञ्चविंशस्त्वमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो पञ्चविंशं<sup>५</sup>  
 वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याहू<sup>६</sup> स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते  
 तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति<sup>७</sup> । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमयै-  
 कया न विंशन्यूनाक्षरा विराट् । न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने  
 प्राणा<sup>८</sup> न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवरूढौ । एता-  
 न्कामानवरुन्धे य एवं वेद । ता अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं च विराजं  
 च छन्दो यैतस्याहूः संपत्तामथो अनुष्टुभमनुष्टुबायतनानि ह्य-  
 ज्यानि ॥२॥

गायत्रं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुस्तेजो वै ब्रह्मवर्चसं गायत्री  
 तेजस्वी ब्रह्मवर्चसी भवतीति । शीष्णिहं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहु-  
 रायुर्वो उष्णिगायुष्मान्भवतीति । आनुष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः

<sup>१</sup> लोकांस्त्वाम् L<sup>२</sup> om F, G<sup>३</sup> भवति F G<sup>४</sup> उरू L<sup>५</sup> आत्मीय A<sup>६</sup> पञ्चविंश L<sup>७</sup> गृह स्तोमस् D ■ F ■ L here

and usually The evidence of the MSS for the dropping of visarga before s and  
 a hard consonant is so strong that the practice has been followed throughout after  
 the example of Prof Macdonell's *Rigveda* I xxvi see above ¶ 10 R and S  
 retain visarga

<sup>८</sup> भवति F ■<sup>९</sup> प्राणा K Cf I 3 7 a 2



स्रवं वा अनुष्टुप्श्वन्स्याशा इति । बार्हतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः  
 श्रीर्वै बृहती श्रीमान्भवतीति । पाङ्क्तं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुरन्नं वै  
 पङ्क्तिरन्नवांभवतीति । चैष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्वीर्यं वै त्रिष्टु-  
 वीर्यवान्भवतीति । जागतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्जागता वै पशवः  
 पशुमान्भवतीति । तदु गायत्रमेव कुर्याद्ब्रह्म वै गायत्री ब्रह्मतद-  
 हर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते । तदु माधुछन्दसम् । मधु ह स वा  
 षष्ठिभ्यो मधुछन्दाश्छन्दति तन्मधुछन्दसो मधुछन्दस्त्वम् । अथो<sup>1</sup>  
 अन्नं वै मधु सर्वे<sup>2</sup> वै मधु<sup>3</sup> सर्वे वै कामा मधु तद्यन्माधुछन्दसं  
 शंसति सर्वेषां कामानामवरुह्यै । सर्वान्कामानवरुह्ये<sup>4</sup> य एवं  
 वेद । तद्वैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च<sup>5</sup>  
 वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्र-  
 तिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति<sup>6</sup> य एवं वेद येषां  
 चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति ॥३॥

वायवा याहि दर्शतेमे सोमा अरंकृता इत्येतद्वा अहररं  
 यजमानाय च देवेभ्यश्च । अरं हास्मा एतदहर्भवति य एवं  
 वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रवायू इमे सुता आ  
 यातमुप निष्कृतमिति यद्वै निष्कृतं तत्संस्कृतम् । आ हास्येन्द्र-

<sup>1</sup> अथो L.<sup>2</sup> bis in F.<sup>3</sup> यान् F.<sup>4</sup> अरुह्ये is the

regular form in R, S, and the MSS., and so is followed, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 231. On the other hand अरुह्ये, which is always read in R and which occurs sporadically in the MSS., is simply an example of the constant tendency of MSS. to reduce consonant groups, and is incorrect. S has अरुह्ये throughout. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 269. <sup>5</sup> om. F. - <sup>6</sup> corr. from प्रतिष्ठन्ति A.

<sup>1</sup> तिष्कृतम् A.

वायू संस्कृतं गच्छतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता  
 शंसति । मित्रं हुवे पूतदक्षं धियं घृताचीं<sup>१</sup> साधन्तेति<sup>२</sup> वाग्वै  
 धीर्घृताची<sup>३</sup> । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं  
 विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । अश्विना यज्वरीरिष इत्यन्नं वा इषो  
 ऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुह्ये । आ यातं रुद्रवर्तनी इत्या हास्याश्विनौ यज्ञं  
 गच्छतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रा  
 याहि चित्रभानविन्द्रा याहि धियेषित इन्द्रा याहि तूतुजान  
 इत्यायाह्यायाहीति शंसति । आ हास्येन्द्रो यज्ञं गच्छति य एवं<sup>४</sup>  
 वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । ओमासश्चपैणीधृतो  
 विश्वे देवास आ गतेत्या हास्य विश्वे देवा हवं गच्छन्ति य एवं  
 वेद<sup>५</sup> येषां चैवं<sup>६</sup> विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । दाश्यांसी दाशुषः  
 सुतमिति यदाह ददुषो<sup>७</sup> ददुषः सुतमित्येव तदाह । ददति<sup>८</sup>  
 हास्मै तं कामं देवा यत्काम एतच्छंसति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं  
 विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । पावका नः सरस्वती यज्ञं वष्टु धिया-  
 वसुरिति वाग्वै धियावसुः । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद  
 येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । यज्ञं वष्टुति यदाह यज्ञं  
 वहत्वित्येव तदाह । ताः पराग्वचनेनैकविंशतिर्भवन्त्येकविंशोऽयं  
 पुरुषो दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या आत्मेकविंशस्तमिममा-  
 त्मानमेकविंशं संस्कुप्ते । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमया पञ्चविं-

<sup>१</sup> घृताची A.<sup>२</sup> साधयन्तेति B; साधतेति G<sup>४</sup> धीताची F.<sup>५</sup> om. F.<sup>६</sup> ददुषा G.<sup>७</sup> तदति K.<sup>८</sup> भवति L.

शतिर्भवन्ति<sup>1</sup> पञ्चविंश<sup>10</sup> आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या  
अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मेव पञ्चविंशस्त-  
मिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुते । अथो<sup>11</sup> पञ्चविंशं वा  
एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते  
तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति भवन्ति ॥४॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>12</sup>

### ADHYĀYA 2.

‘आ त्वा रथं यथोतय इदं वसो सुतमन्थ इति मरुत्वतीयस्य  
प्रतिपदनुचरौ । ऐकाहिकी रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि  
किञ्च<sup>1</sup> किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव, शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्टैकाहः शा-  
न्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं  
वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्वोता शंसति । इन्द्र नेदीय एदिहि प्र  
सू तिरा शचीभिर्मे त उक्थिन इत्युक्थं<sup>2</sup> वा एतदहस्कथवदू-  
पसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । प्रैतु ब्रह्मणस्पतिरक्षा वीरमिति वीर-  
वदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । उत्तिष्ठ ब्रह्मणस्पते<sup>3</sup> सुवीर्यमिति

<sup>1</sup> पञ्चविंशति भन्ति A

पञ्चविंशस्—संस्कुते.

<sup>10</sup> पञ्चविंशं A.

<sup>11</sup> After this P repeats

पञ्चविंशस्—संस्कुते. <sup>12</sup> Text, A, B, इति प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः L ;  
इति प्रथम आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥ K, ओं प्रथमोऽध्यायः F ; प्रथमोऽध्यायः  
D, G ; हरिः ओं B, इत्यैतरेयब्राह्मणारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमाध्याये चतुर्थः  
खण्डः ॥४॥ इति बृहचब्राह्मणारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥

It has been followed in the text. It is of course certain that the divisions and  
colophons have no claim to be regarded as contemporaneous with the composition of  
the work, in which the only divisions were probably the Adhyāyas and Āraṇyakas.

<sup>1</sup> किं च to एतद् is represented by “ in A, and thus is regularly done when  
a passage is repeated or words are repeated. The several instances are not noted  
separately hereafter <sup>2</sup> उक्थे F. <sup>3</sup> रूपं F. <sup>4</sup> ब्रह्मणस्पते—प्र ब्रूषं

वीर्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । प्र नूनं<sup>१</sup> ब्रह्मणस्पतिर्मन्त्रं वद-  
 त्युक्त्यमित्युक्तं<sup>२</sup> वा एतदहस्त्ववद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् ।  
 अग्निर्नेता स वृचहेति<sup>३</sup> वार्वर्ध्नमिन्द्ररूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो  
 रूपम् । त्वं सोम क्रतुभिः सुक्रतुर्भूस्त्वं वृषा वृषत्वेभिर्महितेति  
 वृषत्तद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । पिबन्त्यपो  
 ऽत्यं न मिहे वि नयन्ति वाजिनमिति वाजिमद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूप-  
 मैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । अथो उत्सं दुहन्ति स्तनयन्तम-  
 क्षितमिति स्तनयद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् ।  
 प्र व इन्द्राय बृहत इति यज्ञै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्द्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो  
 रूपम् । बृहदिन्द्राय गायतेति यज्ञै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्द्रूपसमृद्धमे-  
 तस्याहो रूपम् । नक्तिः<sup>४</sup> सुदासो रथं पर्यास न रीरमदिति  
 पर्यस्तवद्रान्तिमद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । सर्वान्प्रगाथाञ्छंसति  
 सर्वेषामहामाग्निं सर्वेषामुक्त्यानां सर्वेषां<sup>५</sup> पृष्ठानां सर्वेषां शस्त्राणां  
 सर्वेषां प्रउगाणां सर्वेषां सवनानाम् ॥१॥

असत्सु मे जरितः साभिवेगः सत्यधृतमिति शंसति सत्यं  
 वा एतदहः सत्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तदु वासुक्रं ब्रह्म  
 वै वसुक्रो ब्रह्मेतदहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते । तदाहुरथ कस्मा-

on F, G, because of ब्रह्मणस्पतिः following

<sup>१</sup> इत्युक्त्य ७२ G, वदुक्<sup>२</sup> A

<sup>३</sup> इन्द्ररूपा F, G

<sup>४</sup> कित् G

<sup>५</sup> सर्वेषा पृष्ठाना ७२ F

<sup>६</sup> This Khandā

is numbered 5 in A, D, E F, G K, L, 5 at the end of the commentary in R, and  
 1 at the end of the text. In S both numbers are given throughout. I have kept  
 the lower number for the sake of convenience, as references to the Aitareya have in  
 the past been based on R. Cf Z D W G, ALII, 171

द्यासुक्तेणैतन्मरुत्वतीयं प्रतिपद्यत इति न ह वा एतदन्यो वसु-  
क्रान्मरुत्वतीयमुदयच्छन्न विव्याचेति तस्माद्यासुक्तेणैवैतन्मरुत्वतीयं  
प्रतिपद्यते । तदनिरुक्तं प्राजापत्यं शंसत्यनिरुक्ती वै प्रजापतिः  
प्रजापतेराणै । सकृदिन्द्रं निराह तेनैन्द्रादूपाच्च प्रच्यवते । पिवा  
सोममभि यमुय तर्दे<sup>1</sup> इति शंसति । ऊर्वं गव्यं महि गृणान  
इन्द्रेति महद्बदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तदु भारद्वाजं भरद्वाजो  
ह वा ऋषीणामनूचानतमो दीर्घजीवितमस्तपस्वितम आस  
स एतेन सूक्तेन पाप्मानमपाहत तद्यज्ञारद्वाजं शंसति पाप्मनो  
ऽपहत्या अनूचानो दीर्घजीवी तपस्यसानीति तस्माद्भारद्वाजं  
शंसति । कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा इति शंसति । आ शासते  
प्रति हर्यन्त्युक्थेत्युक्थं वा एतदहर्कथवदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो  
रूपम् । तदु कयाशुभीयमेतद्वै संज्ञानं सन्तानि सूक्तं यत्कयाशु-  
भीयमेतेन ह वा इन्द्रोऽगस्त्यो मरुतस्ते समजानत तद्यत्कया-  
शुभीयं शंसति संज्ञात्या एव । तद्यायुषं तद्योऽस्य प्रियः<sup>2</sup> स्यात्कु-  
र्यादेवास्य कयाशुभीयम् । मरुताँ इन्द्र वृषभो रणायेति शंसति ।  
इन्द्र वृषभ इति वृषखद्या इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो  
रूपम् । तदु विश्वामित्रं विश्वस्य ह वै मित्रं विश्वामित्र आस ।  
विश्वं हास्म मित्रं भवति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्वीता  
शंसति । जनिष्ठा उयः सहसे तुरायेति निविडानमैकाहिकं

<sup>1</sup> वसुक्तेणैतन् ० वसुक्तेण तन् Γ, वाशु<sup>०</sup> B    <sup>2</sup> वासुकान् E    <sup>3</sup> वासु-  
क्तेणैतन् ॥ Γ, वासुक्तेणैतन् ॥    <sup>4</sup> दर्द K    <sup>5</sup> प्रिय स्वाद् F, G    The  
omission occurs sporadically in the MSS but has no sufficient authority to justify its  
adoption

रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि<sup>१</sup> किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते  
 शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः  
 प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्योता  
 शंसति । ताः पराग्वचनेन सप्तनवतिर्भवन्ति सा या नवतिस्त्रि-  
 स्रस्तास्त्रिंशिन्यो विराजोऽथ याः सप्तानियन्ति यैवैषा प्रशंसा  
 साशस्य<sup>२</sup> तस्या एव । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमयैकशतं भवन्ति  
 पञ्चाङ्गुलयश्चतुष्पदौ द्वे कक्षसी दोष्वाश्चष्टांसफलकं च सा  
 पञ्चविंशतिः पञ्चविंशानोतराणि स्यद्भानि तच्छतमात्मैकशत-  
 तमः । यच्छतं तदायुरिन्द्रियं वीर्यं तेजो यजमान एकशततम  
 आयुषीन्द्रिये वीर्ये तेजसि प्रतिष्ठितः । तास्त्रिष्टुभमभिसंपद्यन्ते  
 त्रैष्टुभो हि मध्यन्दिनः ॥२॥<sup>३</sup>

तदाहुः किं मेहस्य मेहत्वमित्ययं<sup>४</sup> वै मेहो योऽयं पवत  
 एष<sup>५</sup> क्षेषु लोकेषु<sup>६</sup> मेहत<sup>७</sup> इति<sup>८</sup> तत्मेहस्य मेहत्वम् । एकं  
 फलकं स्यादित्याहुरेकधा क्षेवायं वायुः पवतेऽस्य रूपेणेति ।  
 तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । वीणि फलकानि स्युरित्याहुस्तयो वा इमे  
 चिवृत्तो लोका एषां रूपेणेति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । द्वे एव स्यातां  
 द्वौ वा इमौ लोकावज्ञातमाविव दृश्येते य<sup>९</sup> उ एने क्षन्तरेणा-

<sup>१</sup> एतस्मिन् A    <sup>२</sup> प्रथमाशस्य G    <sup>३</sup> Numbered 6 in A D E F, G K, L  
 and also in B in text In B in commentary = 2

<sup>४</sup> From अयं इति on F From मेहत्वं to क्षेषु on G F has मेहत्वं

<sup>५</sup> एष R (by misprint) A, D E, K, L S, and R in commentary have text)

<sup>६</sup> लोके L    <sup>७</sup> मेहत G    <sup>८</sup> ये R in text.

काशः सोऽन्तरिक्षलोकस्तस्माद्दे एव स्याताम् । औदुम्बरे स्या-  
तामूर्वा अन्नाद्यमुदुम्बर ऊर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरूढौ । मध्यत उद्भृते  
स्यातां मध्यतो वै प्रजा अन्नं धिनोति मध्यत एव तदन्नाद्यस्य  
यजमानं दधाति । उभयो रज्जवो भवन्ति दक्षिणाश्च सव्याश्च<sup>६</sup>  
दक्षिणा वा एकेषां पशूनां रज्जवः सव्या एकेषां तद्यदुभयो  
रज्जवो भवन्त्युभयेषां पशूनामासौ । दार्ष्यः<sup>७</sup> स्युर्दर्भो वा ओष-  
धीनामपहतपाप्मा<sup>८</sup> तस्माद्धार्ष्यः<sup>७</sup> स्युः ॥३॥

अरलिमात्र उपरि भूमेः<sup>१</sup> प्रेहः<sup>२</sup> स्यादित्याहुरेतावता वै  
स्वर्गा लोकाः संमिता इति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । प्रादेशमात्रे स्या-  
दित्याहुरेतावता वै प्राणाः संमिता इति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । मुष्टि-  
मात्रे स्यादेतावता वै सर्वमन्नाद्यं क्रियत एतावता सर्वमन्नाद्य-  
मभिपन्नं तस्मान्मुष्टिमात्र एव स्यात् । पुरस्तात्प्रत्यञ्चं प्रेहमधि-  
रोहेदित्याहुरेतस्य रूपेण य एष तपति पुरस्ताद्येष इमाँल्लोकान्प्र-  
त्यङ्मधिरोहतीति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । तिर्यञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुस्तिर्यञ्चं  
वा अश्वमधिरोहन्ति तेनो सर्वान्कामानवाप्नुवामेति । तत्तन्ना-  
दृत्यम् । अन्वञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुरनूचीं वै नावमधिरोहन्ति नौ-  
र्वेषा स्वर्गयाणी यत्प्रेह इति तस्मादन्वञ्चमेवाधिरोहेत् । छुवुके-  
नोपस्पृशेच्छुको हैवं वृक्षमधिरोहति स उ वयसामन्नादतम इति  
तस्माच्छुवुकेनोपस्पृशेत् । बाहुभ्यामधिरोहेदेवं श्येनो वयांस्यभि-

<sup>६</sup> sm. F.<sup>७</sup> दार्ष्य D, E, F, G, K, L.<sup>८</sup> अपहृतपाप्मा F.<sup>२</sup> Numbered १ in A, D, E, F, G, K, L.<sup>१</sup> भूमे F.<sup>२</sup> प्रेह D, E, F, G, K, L.

निविशत एवं वृक्षं स उ वयसां वीर्यवत्तम इति तस्माद्वाहु-  
 भ्यामधिरोहेत् । अस्यै पादं नोच्छिन्द्याच्चेदस्यै प्रतिष्ठाया उच्छिद्या  
 इति । प्रेहं होताधिरोहन्त्योदुसरीमासन्दीमुद्गाता वृषा वै प्रेहो  
 योषासन्दी तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्ये ।  
 प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । अथान्नं वै प्रेहः<sup>१</sup> श्रीरा-  
 सन्धन्नं चैव तच्छ्रियं चान्वधिरोहतः<sup>२</sup> । वृसीर्होचकाः समधि-  
 रोहन्ति सप्तलकाः । समुत्तृष्य वा श्लोपधिवनस्पतयः फलं  
 गृह्णाति<sup>३</sup> तद्यदेतस्मिन्नहनि सर्वशः समधिरोहन्तीपमेव तदूर्ज-  
 मन्नाद्यमधिरोहन्त्यूर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावस्ति । वपटृत्याचरोहेदित्याहुः ।  
 तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । अकृता वै सापचितिर्यामपश्यते करोति । निगृह्य  
 भक्षमवरोहेदित्याहुः । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । अकृता वै सापचितिर्या-  
 मधृष्टाय<sup>४</sup> करोति । प्रतिख्याय भक्षमवरोहेदेषा वा अपचि-  
 तिर्या<sup>५</sup> पश्यते करोति तस्मात्प्रतिख्यायैव भक्षमवरोहेत् ।  
 प्राङ्वरोहेत् । प्राग्वै देवरेतसं<sup>६</sup> प्रजायते तस्मात्प्राङ्वरोहेदव-  
 रोहेत् ॥४॥<sup>७</sup>

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>८</sup>

<sup>१</sup> प्रेह D, E, &c      <sup>२</sup> अधिरोहतः A, D, L, F, G, K, L, S, the commentary shows the reading, yet R has 'रोहते.      <sup>३</sup> गृह्णाति R in text.      <sup>४</sup> अधृष्टा F, G.      <sup>५</sup> र्यामपश्यते D, L.      <sup>६</sup> प्राङ् R in text.      <sup>७</sup> देवरेतः सं (?) S.  
<sup>१०</sup> प्राङ् L.      <sup>११</sup> Numbered 8 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L.      <sup>१२</sup> Text, A, L, R;  
 no colophon, E; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D; द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति प्रथम आरण्ये  
 द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K.



## ADHYĀVA 3.

हिङ्कारेणैतदहः प्रतिपद्येतेत्याहुः । ब्रह्म वै हिङ्कारो ब्रह्मैत-  
 दहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते य एवं वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण  
 प्रतिपद्यता३इ वृषा वै हिङ्कारो योषर्त्तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव  
 तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं  
 वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ यथा वा श्मिरेवं ब्रह्मणो  
 हिङ्कारो यद्वै किञ्चाभियाभितितृत्सत्यभ्येवैतच्चृणस्येवम् । यं कामं  
 कामयते हिङ्कारेणाभ्येवैनं तृणञ्चि य एवं वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण  
 प्रतिपद्यता३इ वाचो वा एषा व्यावृत्तिर्देवै<sup>१</sup> च मानुष्यै च यद्धि-  
 ङ्कारः । स यद्धिङ्कृत्य प्रतिपद्यते वाचमेव तद्वावर्तयति दैवीं  
 च मानुषीं च ॥१॥<sup>२</sup>

तदाहुः कैतस्याहः प्रतिपदिति । मनश्च वाक्चेति ब्रूयात् ।  
 सर्वेऽन्यस्मिन्कामाः<sup>३</sup> श्रिताः सर्वानन्या<sup>४</sup> कामान्दुहे । मनसि वै  
 सर्वे कामाः श्रिता मनसा हि सर्वान्कामान्ध्यायति । सर्वे  
 हास्मिन्कामाः श्रयन्ते य एवं वेद । वाग्वै सर्वान्कामान्दुहे वाचा  
 हि सर्वान्कामान्वदति । सर्वान्हास्मै कामान्वाग्दुहे य एवं वेद ।  
 तदाहुर्नैतदहर्चचा न यजुषा न सामा प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्येत नर्चो

<sup>१</sup> किं पाधियामिति तृत्सति K.<sup>२</sup> देवै G.<sup>३</sup> Numbered 9 in

A, E, K, L. F and G have both १ and ९. D has १

<sup>४</sup> सर्वे F.<sup>५</sup> कामा E, and so regularly when f or s is followed by

a semivowel or soft mute

<sup>६</sup> अन्यान् S.<sup>७</sup> वाग्—वेद repeated in F, G

न यजुषो न साम्न इत्यादिति । तदेता एव<sup>१</sup> व्याहृतीः पुरस्ता-  
ज्जपेत् । भूर्भुवः<sup>२</sup> स्वरित्येता वाच व्याहतय इमे त्रयो वेदा  
भूरित्येव ऋग्वेदो भुव इति यजुर्वेदः स्वरिति सामवेदः । तन्नर्चा  
न यजुषा न साम्ना प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्यते नर्चो न यजुषो न साम्न  
एति ॥२॥<sup>३</sup>

तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्नमन्नमेव तदभिप्रति-  
पद्यते । एतां वाच प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्व-  
क्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी वाचं व्याहर-  
त्येकाक्षरद्वक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैव तत्तत्तवत्या<sup>४</sup> वाचा प्रति-  
पद्यते ) तदुक्तमृषिणा । बृहस्यो प्रथमं वाचो अयमित्येतद्वेव  
प्रथमं वाचो अयम् । यत्परत नामधेयं दधाना इति वाचा हि  
नामधेयानि धीयन्ते । यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासीदित्येतद्वेव श्रेष्ठमे-  
तदरिप्रम् । प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरितीदमु ह गुहाध्यात्म-  
मिमा देवता अद ॥ आविरधिदेवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति ॥३॥<sup>५</sup>

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यत एतद्वाच भुवनेषु  
ज्येष्ठम् । यतो जज्ञ उयस्वेयनृम्ण इत्यतो होष जात उयस्वे-  
यनृम्णः । सद्यो जज्ञानो निरिणाति शबूनिति सद्यो होष  
जातः पाप्मानमपाहत । अनु यं विश्वे मदन्यूमा इति भूतानि

<sup>१</sup> om. B<sup>२</sup> सुव E.<sup>३</sup> तन्नर्चा A<sup>४</sup> Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L ;

10 and 2 in F, G ; 2 in D.

<sup>५</sup> यदेष S<sup>123</sup>, तदेवे om F.<sup>६</sup> अद्वक्षर om. R in text<sup>७</sup> तत्तवत्या L<sup>८</sup> मत्त A.<sup>९</sup> Numbered 11 in A, E, G, K, L, 11, 3 in F, 3 in D. See I, 3, 6

वै विश्व ऊमास्त एनमनुमदन्पुद्गादुद्गादिति । वावृधानः  
 श्वसा भूर्योजा इति एष वै वावृधानः श्वसा भूर्योजाः ।  
 श्चुर्दासाय भियसं दधातीति सर्वे<sup>१</sup> ह्येतस्माद्वीभाय<sup>२</sup> । अथ्यनञ्च  
 व्यन्तञ्च सस्त्रीति यञ्च प्राणि<sup>३</sup> यच्चाप्राणकमित्येव तदाह । सं ते  
 नवन्त ग्रभृता मदेध्विति तव सर्वे वश इत्येव तदाह । वि  
 क्रतुमपि वृञ्जन्ति विश्व इति त्वयीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि  
 सर्वाणि मनांसि सर्वे क्रतवोऽपि वृञ्जन्तीत्येव तदाह । द्विर्यदेते  
 चिर्भवन्पूमा इति द्वौ वै सन्तौ मिथुनौ प्रजायेते प्रजात्यै<sup>४</sup> ।  
 प्रजायते<sup>५</sup> प्रजया षण्भिर्ये एवं वेद । स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना  
 सृजा समिति मिथुनं वै स्वादु प्रजा स्वादु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजां  
 संसृजति<sup>६</sup> । अदः सु मधु मधुनाभि गोधीरिति मिथुनं वै मधु  
 प्रजा मधु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजामभियुध्यति । तदुक्तमृषिणा । स्वां  
 यज्ञनूं तन्वामैरयतेत्यस्यां शारीर्यामिमां छन्दोमयीमित्येव तदाह ।  
 अथो तनूरेव तन्वो अस्तु भेषजमित्यस्यै शारीर्या इयं छन्दोम-  
 यीत्येव तदाह । तस्यै यान्यष्टावक्षराणि सा गायत्री यान्येकादश  
 सा त्रिष्टुब्धानि द्वादश सा जगत्यथ यानि दश सा विराड्दृष्टिन्येषु  
 त्रिष्टु<sup>७</sup> छन्दःसु प्रतिष्ठिता । पुरुष इति अक्षरं ॥ ३ ॥ विराजि ।  
 एतानि वाच<sup>८</sup> सर्वाणि छन्दांसि यान्येतानि विरादुत्तुर्थान्येवसु  
 हैवैवं विदुष एतदहः सर्वेऽछन्दोभिः प्रतिपन्नं भवति ॥ ४ ॥<sup>९</sup>

<sup>१</sup> एवं A.<sup>२</sup> उद्गाद once only in F<sup>३</sup> श्चुर् E. in text<sup>४</sup> सर्वे—दीमाय om. S, clearly by an oversight.<sup>५</sup> प्राण G.<sup>६</sup> वृञ्जति

R in text.

<sup>७</sup> प्रावाति D, om. G.<sup>८</sup> om G.<sup>९</sup> यञ्जति A.<sup>१०</sup> भेषजं E; भेषजा F, G.<sup>११</sup> त्रिष्टु G<sup>१२</sup> वष F.<sup>१३</sup> Numbered 12

in A, E, K, L, 12, 4 in F, G, 4 in D R has 4 in text and 12 in commentary

ता नदेन विहरति<sup>१</sup> । पुरुषो वै नदस्तस्मात्पुरुषो वदन्सर्वः  
 संनदतीव । नदं व ओदतीनामिती<sup>२</sup>३ आपो वा ओदत्यो या  
 दिव्यास्ता हीदं सर्वमुन्दन्यापो वा ओदत्यो या मुख्यास्ता हीदं  
 सर्वमन्नाद्यमुन्दन्ति । नदं योयुवतीनामिती<sup>३</sup>३ आपो वाव  
 योयुवत्यो या अन्तरिक्षास्ता हि पोभूयन्त इवापो वाव योयु-  
 वत्यो याः स्वेदते<sup>४</sup> ता हि सरीसृथन्त इव । पतिं वो अघ्नाना-  
 मिती<sup>३</sup>३ आपो वा अघ्ना या अपेर्धूमाज्जायन्त आपो वा  
 अघ्ना याः शिघ्रात्मसृज्यन्ते । धेनूनामिषुध्यसीती<sup>३</sup>३ आपो वाव  
 धेनवस्ता हीदं सर्वं धिन्वन्तीषुध्यसीति यदाह पतीयसीत्येव  
 तदाह । विष्टुभं चानुष्टुभं च विहरति वृषा वै चिष्टुव्योषानुष्टुभ-  
 न्निष्टुनं तस्मादपि पुरुषो जायां विस्वा कृत्स्नतरमिवात्मानं  
 मन्यते । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा  
 पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्देश<sup>५</sup> हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा  
 ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आन्मिव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं  
 संस्क्रुते । अथो पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह  
 स्तोमस्तत्तमेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भ-  
 वन्ति ॥ ५ ॥<sup>६</sup>

<sup>१</sup> विरहति E.<sup>२</sup> अदति A.<sup>३</sup> सिदति A, D, E, F, G, K, L, S.

स्वेदते B.

<sup>४</sup> पतीयसीति D, E, F, G.<sup>५</sup> The words after दश are

omitted by \* in B.

<sup>६</sup> Numbered १३ in A, E, K, L; १३, ६ in F; १३, ६ in G;

|| in D. E has १३ in text, but ३ in commentary.

तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्त्रमन्त्रमेव तदभिप्रति-  
पद्यते । एतां वाच<sup>१</sup> प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षर-  
द्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी<sup>२</sup> वाचं  
व्याहरत्येकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैव तत्ततवत्या<sup>३</sup> वाचा  
प्रतिपद्यते । तदुक्तमृषिणा । बृहस्पते प्रथमं वाचो अयमित्ये-  
तद्वेव प्रथमं वाचो अयम् । यत्प्रैरत नामधेयं दधाना इति  
वाचा हि नामधेयानि धीयन्ते । यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासी-  
दित्येतद्वेव श्रेष्ठमेतदरिप्रम् । प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरि-  
तीदमु ह गुहाध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद च आविरधिदैवतमित्ये-  
तत्तदुक्तं भवति ॥६॥<sup>४</sup>

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यते यच्च ज्येष्ठं तन्महन्म-  
हद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तां सु ते<sup>५</sup> कीर्तिं मघवन्म-  
हित्वेति महद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । भूय इद्वानृधे वीर्या-  
येति वीर्यवद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । नृणां तु नृतमं गीर्भि-  
रुक्थैरित्युक्थं वा एतदहर्ब्रह्मवद्ब्रह्मसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् ।  
न्यूनाक्षरे प्रथमे पदे विहरति न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने<sup>६</sup> प्राणा  
न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवस्थी । एतान्कामानव-

<sup>१</sup> In A all from वाच — अधिदैवतम् as represented by \* It has only तदिति प्रतिपद्यते भवति See I, 3, 3 <sup>२</sup> प्रथमवाचं only L <sup>३</sup> व्याहर इति B in text, व्याहरेत्य G and D pr. man. <sup>४</sup> तदवत्या F, G. <sup>५</sup> Numbered 14 in A, E, K, L, 14, 6 in F, G; 6 in D It is numbered 4 in B because the number 13 of the previous section was in the commentary printed as 31

<sup>६</sup> सुता ते F, G

<sup>७</sup> न्यूने प्राणा on F; प्राणा B Cf I, 1, 2, 10

रुन्धे य एवं वेद । हे दशाक्षरे भवत उभयोरन्नाद्ययोरुपास्यै यच्च  
पञ्चदशापादकमिति । अष्टादशाष्टादशाक्षराणि भवन्ति यानि  
दश नव प्राणा आत्मैव दशमः सात्मनः संस्कृतिरष्टावष्टा  
उद्यन्ते । अश्रुते यद्यत्कामयते य एवं वेद ॥७॥<sup>३</sup>

ता नदेन विहरति । प्राणो वै नदस्तस्मात्प्राणो नदत्सर्वः  
संनदतीव । नदं व ओदतीनामिती<sup>३</sup> उष्णिगक्षरैर्भवत्यनुष्टुप्पा-  
दैरायुर्वा उष्णिग्वागनुष्टुप् । तदस्मिन्नायुष्य वाचं च दधाति ।  
तास्त्रिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा पञ्चविंशः  
प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू  
आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो  
पञ्चविंशं वा एतद्दहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह स्तोमस्तत्तमेन समं  
प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्दे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति । इत्यध्यात्मं पञ्चविंशः ।  
अथाधिदैवतम् । चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः ता एताः पञ्च  
देवता इमं विष्टाः<sup>४</sup> पुरुषः<sup>५</sup> पञ्चो ह्येवैता<sup>६</sup> देवता अयं विष्टः  
पुरुषः । सोऽंघालोमभ्य आनखेभ्यः सर्वः साङ्ग<sup>७</sup> आप्यते  
तस्मात्सर्वाणि भूतान्यामिपीलिकाभ्य आप्रान्येव जायन्ते । तदु-  
क्तमृषिणा । सहस्रधा पञ्चदशान्युक्थेति पञ्च हि दशती भवन्ति ।  
यावद्यावापृथिवी तावदित्तदिति यावती वै द्यावापृथिवी ता-

<sup>३</sup> Numbered 15 in A, E, K, L, 15, 7 in F, G; 7 in D. E has 5 in text and 7 and 5 in commentary.

<sup>४</sup> विविष्टाः E.

<sup>५</sup> पुरुषो K.

<sup>६</sup> हेवे K.

<sup>७</sup> सोरः A; सोरः E.

<sup>८</sup> सर्वसाङ्ग K.

वानात्मा । सहस्रधा महिमानः सहस्रमित्युक्त्यान्वेव तदनुमदति  
महयति । यावद्ब्रह्म विधितं जावती वागिति यत्र ह कृ च  
ब्रह्म तद्वाग्यव वा वाक्कदा ब्रह्मेत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एषां वा  
एषां सूक्तानां नवर्चं प्रथमं नव वै प्राणाः प्राणानां कृष्यै ।  
षष्ठ्यं<sup>6</sup> भवति षड्वा ऋतव ऋतूनामांशैः । पञ्चर्चं भवति<sup>7</sup>  
पञ्चपदा पङ्क्तिः पङ्क्तिर्वा अक्षमन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धैः । तृचो भवति  
त्रयो वा इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ता  
अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं छन्दोऽमृतं देवलोकमेष<sup>8</sup> आत्मा । एवमुहै-  
वैवं<sup>10</sup> विदेतयैव संपदामृतमेवात्मानमभिसंभवति संभवति ॥८॥<sup>11</sup>

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>12</sup>

#### ADHYAYA 4.

अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि  
संदधाति । अथातो यीवाः । ता आचक्षते यथाछन्दसमुष्णिह  
इति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि  
संदधाति । अथातः शिरः । तन्नायचीषु भवत्ययं वै छन्दसां  
गायत्र्ययमङ्गानां<sup>1</sup> शिरः । तदर्कवतीषु भवत्यग्निर्वा अर्कः । ता

<sup>6</sup> षष्ठ्यं R in text; षड्यं A, G; पञ्च्यं F; text, D, E, K, L.

<sup>7</sup> ऋतूनाम्

R in text; ऋतून् A.

<sup>8</sup> om. ॥ in text. It is in R in commentary and in

all the MSS. and in B.

<sup>9</sup> जेव K.

<sup>10</sup> हुवेव K.

<sup>11</sup> Numbered

16 in A, E, F, K, L; 16, 8 in G; no number in D. R in text has 6, in com-  
mentary 16.

<sup>12</sup> इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः A; इति प्रथम आरण्ये  
(प्रथमारण्यके L) तृतीयोऽध्यायः K, L; तृतीयोऽध्यायः D, F, G; nothing in E, or  
by an error in B in text.

<sup>1</sup> छन्दसांगानाम् omitting the rest, P.

नव भवन्ति नवकपालं वै शिरः । दशमीं शंसति त्वक्केशा<sup>२</sup>  
 इत्येव सा भवति । अथो स्तोमातिशंसनाया एव । तौ त्रिवृच्च  
 स्तोमो<sup>३</sup> भवतो गायत्रं च छन्द एतयोर्वै स्तोमछन्दसोः प्रजा-  
 तिमनु सर्वमिदं प्रजायते यदिदं किञ्च प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते<sup>४</sup>  
 प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो<sup>५</sup> वै  
 सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातो विजवः । ता  
 विराजो भवन्ति तस्मात्पुरुषः पुरुषमाह वि<sup>६</sup> वा अस्मासु  
 राजसि यीवा वै धारयसीति स्तभमानं वा यद्वा दुताः सद्वा-  
 ळ्हतमाः<sup>७</sup> सत्योऽन्नतमां प्रत्यच्यन्तेऽन्नं हि विराळन्नमु<sup>८</sup>  
 वीर्यम् । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि  
 संदधाति ॥१॥<sup>१०</sup>

अथातो दक्षिणः पक्षः । सोऽयं लोकः सोऽयमग्निः सा  
 वाक्तद्रव्यन्तरं स वसिष्ठस्तच्छतं तानि षड्वीर्याणि भवन्ति ।  
 संपात एव कामानामभ्यासै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय षड्भिः ।  
 अथ<sup>१</sup> सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संद-  
 धाति<sup>२</sup> । अथात उत्तरः पक्षः । सोऽसौ लोकः सोऽसावादित्य-  
 स्तत्मनस्तदृहास भरद्वाजस्तच्छतं तानि षड्वीर्याणि भवन्ति । संपात  
 एव कामानामभ्यासै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय षड्भिः । ता ऊना-

<sup>२</sup> केश R in text<sup>३</sup> स्तोमो R in text ||<sup>४</sup> om F<sup>५</sup> प्राणो

न पर्वाणि omitting the rest F, G

<sup>६</sup> Accented in E<sup>७</sup> सम्बृहत्तमाः R,

सम्बृहत्तमाः A, ळ्हेतमाः E, text, D, F, G, K, L, ||

<sup>८</sup> विराड् A R<sup>९</sup> उप K<sup>१०</sup> Numbered १७ in A, E, K, L, १७, १ in F, G १ in D<sup>१</sup> अथ — संदधाति om in S though the commentary has it



तिरिक्तौ भवतो वृषा वै बृहद्योषा रथन्तरमतिरिक्तं वै पुंसो न्यूनः<sup>१</sup>  
 स्त्रियै तस्मादूनातिरिक्तौ भवतः । अथो एकेन ह वै पञ्चेण  
 सुपर्णस्योत्तरः<sup>२</sup> पक्षो ज्यायांस्तस्मादेकयर्चोत्तरः पक्षो भूयान्भ-  
 वति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि  
 संदधाति । अथातः पुच्छम्<sup>३</sup> । ता एकविंशतिर्द्विपदा<sup>४</sup> भवन्त्ये-  
 कविंशतिर्हीमानि प्रत्यञ्चि सुपर्णस्य पञ्चाणि भवन्ति । अथो  
 एकविंशो वै स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठा पुच्छं वयसाम् । द्वाविंशी<sup>५</sup>  
 शंसति प्रतिष्ठयोरेव तदूर्ध्वं क्रियते तस्मात्सर्वाणि वयांसि पुच्छेन  
 प्रतितिष्ठन्ति पुच्छेनैव प्रतिष्ठायोत्पत्तन्ति प्रतिष्ठा हि पुच्छम् । स  
 एष द्वाभ्यां दशिनीभ्यां विराड्भ्रामनयोर्द्वाविंशोर्द्विपदयोरयं  
 पुरुषः प्रतिष्ठितः । तस्य यत्सुपर्णरूपं तदस्य कामानामभ्यासै ।  
 अथ यत्पुरुषरूपं तदस्य श्रियै यशसेऽन्नाद्यायापचित्यै । अथ  
 सूददोहाः । अथ धाय्या<sup>६</sup> । अथ सूददोहाः । वृषा वै सूददोहा  
 योषा धाय्या तदुभयतः सूददोहसा धाय्यां परिशंसति तस्माद्भूयो  
 रेतः सिक्तं सदेकतामेवापेति योषामेवाभ्यत आजाना<sup>७</sup> हि  
 योषातः प्रजाना तस्मादेनामच शंसति ॥२॥<sup>१०</sup>

गायत्रीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्ययं वै लोको गायत्री तृचाशीति-  
 र्यदेवास्मिँल्लोके यशो यन्मही यन्मिथुनं यदन्वाद्यं यापचितिस्त-  
 दन्नवै तदाप्रवानि तद्वरुण्यै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः ।

<sup>१</sup> नूनं G.<sup>२</sup> \*स्योत्तरतः R<sup>१</sup>; सुपर्णःस्योत्तरः K.<sup>४</sup> पुच्छम् A.<sup>३</sup> द्विपदा — एकविंशतिरु om. F.<sup>५</sup> द्वाविंशीं A.<sup>७</sup> द्वाविंशोर् A.<sup>६</sup> अथ धाय्याय सूददोहाः bis F.<sup>८</sup> आजाना K.<sup>१०</sup> Numbered 18 in

A, E, K, L; 18, 2 in F, G; 2 in D.

प्राणो वै सूदोहाः प्राणेनेमं<sup>१</sup> लोकं संतनोति । बार्हतीं नृचा-  
शीतिं शंसत्यन्तरिक्षलोको वै बार्हती नृचाशीतिर्यदेवान्तरिक्ष-  
लोके यशो यन्महो यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिस्तदग्नवै  
तदाप्रवानि तदवरुणघै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूदोहाः । प्राणो  
वै सूदोहाः प्राणेनान्तरिक्षलोकं संतनोति । औष्णिहीं नृचा-  
शीतिं शंसत्यसौ वै लोको द्यौरौष्णिही नृचाशीतिर्यदेवामुष्णि-  
क्षोके यशो यन्महो<sup>२</sup> यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिः यदेवानां  
देवं तदग्नवै तदाप्रवानि तदवरुणघै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूद-  
ोहाः । प्राणो वै सूदोहाः प्राणेनामुं लोकं संतनोति संत-  
नोति ॥३॥<sup>३</sup>

॥ इत्यितरेयप्रथमारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>४</sup>

### ADHYAYA 5

वशं<sup>१</sup> शंसति वशे म इदं सर्वमसदिति । ता एकविंशतिर्भवं-  
न्त्येकविंशतिर्हि ता अन्तरुदरे विकृतयः । अथो एकविंशो वै  
स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठोदरमन्नाद्यानाम् । ता विछन्दसो भवन्ति  
विक्षुद्रमिव वा अन्तस्त्यमणीय इव च स्थवीय इव च । ताः  
प्रणाव<sup>२</sup> छन्दस्त्वर यथोपपादं शंसति यथोपपादमिव वा  
अन्तस्त्यं हृसीय इव च द्राघीय इव च । अथ सूदोहाः ।

<sup>१</sup> In this section the MSS of S appear to have been defective only A <sup>२</sup> Numbered 19 in A E III L 19 3 in F G 3 in D <sup>३</sup> यशो  
A II इति प्रथम आरणी (प्रथमारण्यके L) चतुर्थोऽध्याय (इथ only L) h L  
इति चतुर्थोऽध्याय D चतुर्थोऽध्याय F G no colophon III

<sup>४</sup> यथ D E L <sup>५</sup> असाद L <sup>६</sup> एकविंशतिर्भवन्ति om F G but  
added by H sec man <sup>७</sup> प्रणाव 1 E O

प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वणि संदधाति । तामचोत्सृजति  
द्वादशकृतः शक्त्वा द्वादशविधा वा इमे प्राणाः सप्त शीर्षण्या  
द्वौ स्तन्यौ त्रयोऽवाञ्चोऽत्र वै प्राणा आप्यन्तेऽत्र संस्क्रियन्ते  
तस्मादेनामचोत्सृजति । इन्द्राग्री युवं सु न इत्येन्द्राग्रा<sup>१</sup> ऊरु  
उर्वधीवे<sup>२</sup> प्रतिष्ठे । ताः षट्पदा भवन्ति प्रतिष्ठाया एव द्विप्र-  
तिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः<sup>३</sup> पशवो यजमानमेव तद्विप्रतिष्ठं  
चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति । द्वितीया सप्तपदा भवति तां  
गायत्रीं चानुष्टुभं च<sup>४</sup> करोति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री वागनुष्टुप्ब्रह्मणैव  
तद्वाचं संदधाति । त्रिष्टुभमन्ततः शंसति वीर्यं<sup>५</sup> वै त्रिष्टुर्ब्रह्मणैव  
तत्प्रशूनपरिगच्छति तस्मात्प्रशवो वीर्यमनूपतिष्ठन्त ईर्यतां चैवा-  
भ्युत्थानं च ॥ १ ॥<sup>११</sup>

प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्यस<sup>१</sup> इत्येन्द्रे निष्केवल्ये<sup>२</sup> निविदं<sup>३</sup>  
दधाति प्रत्यक्षाद्येव<sup>४</sup> तदात्मन्वीर्यं धत्ते । तास्त्रिष्टुच्चगतीषु  
भवन्ति । तदाहुरथ कस्मान्त्रिष्टुच्चगतीषु निविदं दधातीति । न  
ह वा एतस्याहू एकं छन्दो निविदं दाधार न बिब्याचेति  
तस्मान्त्रिष्टुच्चगतीषु निविदं दधाति । तदेतदहस्त्रिनिवित्तं विद्या-  
द्वयो निविद्वाल्खित्या<sup>५</sup> निविन्नविदेव निविदेवमेनत्त्रिनि-  
वित्तं विद्यात् । अथ सूक्ते वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो

<sup>१</sup> इन्द्राग्रा F, G. <sup>२</sup> ऊर्वं R. <sup>३</sup> चतुष्पादः F, G. <sup>४</sup> om. G; चरोति L.

<sup>५</sup> वीर्यं A. <sup>१०</sup> Numbered 20 in A, B, F, K, L; 20, 1 in G; 1 in D.

<sup>१</sup> मन्दना F. <sup>२</sup> निष्केवल्ये F, G. <sup>३</sup> निविद A. <sup>४</sup> प्रत्यक्षाद्येव A, G, K.

<sup>५</sup> वालखिल्यान् G. <sup>६</sup> मेव A; मन्वत् G; मेवत् B in commentary; मेव D, E.

जात एव प्रथमो मनस्वानिति तयोरस्त्वन्ने समस्य यदसन्म-  
नीषा इत्यन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धौ । अथावपनमेते अन्तरेणैन्द्रीणां दश-  
तीनां चिष्टुञ्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां यावतीरावपन्ते तावन्पू-  
र्ध्वमायुषो वर्षाणि जीवन्त्येतेन हैवावपनेनायुराप्यते । प्रजां मे  
पशवोऽर्जयन्ति<sup>7</sup> त्वेव सजनीयमनुशंसति । तार्क्ष्यं शंसति  
स्वस्वयनं वै तार्क्ष्यः स्वस्तितायै स्वस्वयनमेव तत्कुस्ते<sup>8</sup> ।  
एकपदां शंसत्येकपदे सर्वमसानीत्यथो सर्वा छन्दस्कृतिमाप्नुवा-  
नीति । इन्द्रं विश्वा अवीवृधन्ति पदानुषङ्गास्ताः सप्तानुषजति  
सप्त वै शीर्षप्राणाः शीर्षन्नेव<sup>9</sup> तत्प्राणान्दधात्यष्टमीं नानुषजति  
वागष्टमी नेन्ने वाक्प्राणैरनुषक्तासदिति तस्मादु सा वाक्समा-  
नायतना प्राणैः सत्यननुषक्ता । विराजः शंसत्यन्नं वै विराजो  
ऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धौ । वासिष्ठेन परिदधाति वसिष्ठोऽसानीति । एष  
स्तोमो मह उपाय वाह इति महद्यत्या रूपसमृद्धया । धुरी-  
वात्यो न वाजयन्नभायीत्यन्तो वै धूरन्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् ।  
इन्द्र त्वायसर्के ईद्रे वसूनामित्यर्कवत्या रूपसमृद्धया । दिवीव  
द्यामधि नः श्रोमत्<sup>10</sup> धा इति यव ह ऋ च<sup>11</sup> ब्रह्मण्या वागुद्यते  
तद्वास्य<sup>12</sup> कीर्तिर्भवति यच्चैवं विद्वानेतया परिदधाति तस्मादेवं  
विद्वानेतयैव परिदध्यात् ॥ २ ॥<sup>14</sup>

<sup>7</sup> पशवोर्जयन् R in text

<sup>8</sup> कुते F

<sup>9</sup> शंसत्य R in text

<sup>10</sup> शीर्षन्ने F, G, शीर्षन्ने L

<sup>11</sup> न D, E ओ R

<sup>12</sup> ऋ च om E

<sup>13</sup> तद्वास्य R, तद्वासा G तद्वास्य F

<sup>14</sup> Numbered 22 in A, E G, h L.

21 2 in F 2 in D

तत्सवितुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या नो देव सवितरिति वैश्वदेवस्य प्रति-  
 पदनुचरावैकाहिकौ रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च  
 किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव  
 तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां  
 चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । तद्देवस्य सवितुर्वार्यं महदिति  
 सावित्रमन्तो वै महदन्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । कतरा पूर्वा  
 कतरापरायोरिति द्यावापृथिवीयं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा  
 एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । अनश्वो जातो अनभीशुरुक्थ्य इत्यार्भ-  
 वम् । रथस्त्रिचक्र इति यदेतच्चिवत्तदन्ती वै चिवदन्त एतद-  
 हरेतस्याहो रूपम् । अस्य<sup>१</sup> वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति वैश्वदेवं  
 बहुरूपं बहुरूपं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । गौरीर्मिमाय  
 सलिलानि तक्षतीत्येतदन्तम् । आ नो भद्राः क्रतवो यन्तु  
 विश्वत इति वैश्वदेवं निविद्वानमैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा  
 एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शा-  
 न्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति ।  
 प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति ।  
 वैश्वानराय धिषणामृतावृध इत्याग्निमारुतस्य प्रतिपदन्तो वै  
 धिषणान्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । प्रयज्यवो मरुतो भ्राजदृष्टय  
 इति मारुतं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् ।  
 जातवेदसे सुनवाम सोममिति जातवेदस्यां पुरस्तात्सूक्तस्य शंसति  
 स्वस्त्ययनं वै जातवेदस्या<sup>२</sup> स्वस्तितायै स्वस्त्ययनमेव तत्कुरुते ।

<sup>१</sup> पदे S.<sup>२</sup> एतस्यावमस्य omitting the rest, F.<sup>३</sup> धिषण् A.<sup>४</sup> जातवेदस्याः B in text.

इमं स्तोममर्हते जातवेदस इति जातवेदस्यं समानोदकं समानो-  
दकं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपमहो रूपम् ॥३॥<sup>१</sup>

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>२</sup>

॥ इति प्रथमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

<sup>१</sup> Numbered 22 in A, E, K, L., 22, 3 in F, G. <sup>२</sup> Text, A and, omitting the second इति, L. पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ५ । इति प्रथमारण्यकं समाप्तम् । F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः प्रथमारण्यः D. इति प्रथम आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ५ K. E continues after the number एष पञ्चा सप्तमम् । तत्सविर्गुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या ऋ द्वे सवितरिति । म ऋ महे मन्मनायान्यस इति । अथ श्रवति । गायत्री तुषाघीति श्रवति । अघातो दक्षिणः पयः । अथ मूददोहाः । ता नदिन विहरति प्राणो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ऋषिमिति प्रतिपद्यते यद्वि ऋषम् । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । तर्दाङ्गः कितस्त्राङ्गः प्रतिपद्यति । द्विकारेणैतर्दह प्रतिपद्येति त्वाङ्गः । अरन्विमाच उपरि भूमेः मेहु स्वादित्वाङ्गः । तदाङ्गः कि मेहुस्व • मेहुत्वमिति । असत्सु मे जरितस्त्राभिदेगस्त-  
त्यधुतमिति श्रवति । आ स्वा रथ यघीतय इद • वसो मुतमन्थ इति <sup>३</sup> । वाथवा याहि द्यतिमे • सोमा अरक्षता इति • । गायत्र प्रथम कुर्यादित्वाङ्गः । अग्नि नरो दीधितिनि-  
ररथोरित्यन्नायकाम् । अथ महाव्रतम् । अथ महाव्रत चत्वारि । आ स्वा रथ चत्वारि । द्विकारेणाष्टौ । अथ मूददोहास्त्रयः । वज्रस्त्रयः । अथ महाव्रत तदिति म ऋ महे धौ । इति • प्रथमारण्यम् । This appears also in F and E with the variants noted below but not in the other MSS. It forms of course, a sort of Anukraman of the contents and E has similar notices at the end of each Aranyaka

\* Before this, F, G have ता नदिन विहरति प्राणो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ऋषिमिति प्रतिपद्यते एतदाथ भुवनेषु ऋषि । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । These three were obviously omitted accidentally through the identity of three and six

तर्दह<sup>४</sup> F, G      ° om F.      ° इद—इति om F, G      ° इमे—इति

om F, G

<sup>१</sup> अथ G. वाथस्त्रयः om F

<sup>२</sup> om F, G

## ॥ अथ द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

## ADHYĀVA 1.

एष षण्था एतत्कर्मैतद्वृत्तैतत्सत्यम् । तस्मान्न प्रमाद्येत्तन्ना-  
तीयात् । न ह्यत्यायन्पूर्वं येऽत्यायंस्ते परावभूवुः । तदुक्तमृषिणा ।  
प्रजा ह तिस्रो अत्यायमीयुर्न्यया अर्कमभितो विविधे । बृहद्  
तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तः पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति ॥ प्रजा ह  
तिस्रो<sup>१</sup> अत्यायमीयुरिति या वै ता इमाः प्रजास्तिस्रो<sup>२</sup> अत्याय-  
मायंस्तानीमानि वयांसि वङ्गावगधाथेरपादाः । न्यया अर्कम-  
भितो विविध इति ता इमाः प्रजा अर्कमभितो निविष्टा  
इममेवाग्निम् । बृहद् तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तरित्यद उ एव बृहद्भुवने-  
ष्वन्तरसावादित्यः । पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति वायुरेव  
पवमानो दिशो<sup>३</sup> हरित आविष्टः<sup>४</sup> ॥ १ ॥

उक्त्यमुक्त्यमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति तदिदमेवोक्त्यमित्यमेव  
पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च । तस्याग्निरर्कोऽक्षम-  
शीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । अन्तरिक्षमेवोक्त्यमन्तरिक्षं वा  
अनु पतन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु धावयन्ति तस्य वायुरर्कोऽक्षमशीतयो  
ऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । असावेव द्यौस्त्वयममुतः प्रदानाद्हीदं  
सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च तस्यासावादित्योऽर्कोऽक्षमशीतयो

<sup>१</sup> तिस्रः here and below II in text, but the words are clearly quoted in their  
Rgvedic forms    <sup>२</sup> अथर् A    <sup>३</sup> दिशे II in text    <sup>४</sup> आविष्टाः F

ऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुष एवोक्तमयमेव महान्प्रजापतिरहमुक्तमस्मीति विद्यात् । तस्य मुखमेवोक्तं यथा पृथिवी तथा । तस्य वागर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । नासिके एवोक्तं यथान्तरिक्षं तथा । तस्य प्राणोऽर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । तदेतद्ब्रह्मस्य<sup>१</sup> विष्टपं यदेतन्नासिकायै विनतमिव । ललाटमेवोक्तं यथा द्यौस्तथा । तस्य चक्षुरर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्रुते । समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेवाच्चेन हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि समनन्ती<sup>२</sup> अन्नेनेमं लोकं जयत्यन्नेनामुं तस्मात्समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेव । तदिदमन्नमन्नादमियमेव पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च । यद्ध किञ्चेदं प्रेती<sup>३</sup> इ तदसौ सर्वमस्ति यदु किञ्चातः प्रेती<sup>३</sup> तदियं सर्वमस्ति सेयमित्याद्यान्ती । अन्ता ह वा आद्यो भवति । न तस्येशे यन्नाद्याद्यदैनं नाद्युः ॥२॥

अथातो रेतसः सृष्टिः । प्रजापते रेतो देवा देवानां रेतो वर्धं वर्धस्य रेत ओपधय ओपधीनां रेतोऽन्नमन्नस्य रेतो रेतो रेतसो रेतः प्रजाः प्रजानां रेतो हृदयं हृदयस्य रेतो मनो मनसो रेतो वाग्वाचो रेतः कर्म तदिदं कर्म कृतमयं पुरुषो ब्रह्मणो लोकः । स इरामयो यदीरामयस्तस्माद्विरणमयः । हिरण्मयो ह वा अमुष्मिँल्लोके संभवति हिरण्मयः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो ददृशे य एवं वेद ॥३॥

<sup>१</sup> ब्रह्मण G<sup>२</sup> यजत्व<sup>३</sup> G<sup>३</sup> वसंछत<sup>३</sup> ॥



तं प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत<sup>1</sup> ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं यत्प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत  
 ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं तस्मात्प्रपदे तस्मात्प्रपदे इत्याचक्षते शफाः खुरा  
 इत्यन्येषां पशूनाम् । तदूर्ध्वमुदसर्पत्ता ऊरू अभवताम् । उरु  
 गृणीहीत्यब्रवीत्तदुदरमभवत् । उर्वेव मे कुर्वित्यब्रवीत्तदुरोऽभवत् ।  
 उदरं ब्रह्मेति शार्कराष्ट्या<sup>2</sup> उपासते हृदयं ब्रह्मेत्यारुणयो ब्रह्मा-  
 हैव ताऽऽ । ऊर्ध्वं त्वेवोदसर्पत्तच्छिरोऽश्रयत यच्छिरोऽश्रयत  
 तच्छिरोऽभवत्तच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वम् । ता एताः शीर्षज्जिह्वयः  
 श्रिताश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः । अयन्तेऽस्मिज्जिह्वो य  
 एवमेतच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वं वेद । ता अहिंसन्ताहमुक्थमस्यहमु-  
 कथमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तास्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रामाम तद्यस्मिन्न  
 उत्क्रान्त इदं शरीरं पतस्यति तदुक्थं भविष्यतीति । वागुदक्रा-  
 मदवदन्नग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव । चक्षुरुदक्रामदपश्यन्नग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव ।  
 श्रोत्रमुदक्रामदश्रुवन्नग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव । मन उदक्रामन्मीलित  
 इवाग्ननिवन्नास्त्वैव । प्राण उदक्रामत्तत्प्राण उत्क्रान्तेऽपद्यत ।  
 तर्दशीर्यताशरीती<sup>3</sup> तच्छरीरमभवत्तच्छरीरस्य शरीरत्वम् ।  
 शीर्यते ह वा अस्य द्विवर्ष्यायाम् भ्रातृव्यः परास्य द्विवर्ष्यायाम्  
 भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । ता अहिंसन्तैवाहमुक्थमस्यहमु-  
 कथमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तेदं पुनः शरीरं प्रविशाम तद्यस्मिन्नः  
 प्रपन्न इदं शरीरमुत्थास्यति तदुक्थं भविष्यतीति । वाक्प्राविश-  
 दशयदेव । चक्षुः प्राविशदशयदेव । श्रोत्रं<sup>7</sup> प्राविशदशयदेव ।

<sup>1</sup> मापद्यतं G<sup>2</sup> शर्करा G<sup>3</sup> ब्रह्मा हैव R, cp p 68, J R A. S., 1908,

p 366

<sup>4</sup> यत् G, तं om K.<sup>5</sup> उत्क्रान्ते R in text.<sup>6</sup> तशी° E<sup>7</sup> This clause is omitted in G.

मनः प्राविशदश्यदेव । प्राणः प्राविशत्तत्प्राणे प्रपन्न उदतिष्ठ-  
त्तदुक्तमभवत् । तदेतदुक्त्याँ३ प्राण एव । प्राण उक्त्यमित्येव  
विद्यात् । तं देवा अमुवंस्त्वमुक्त्यमसि त्वमिदं सर्वमसि तव वयं  
स्मस्त्वमस्माकमसीति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । त्वमस्माकं तव  
स्ससीति ॥४॥

• तं देवाः प्राणयन्त ॥ प्रणीतः प्रातायत प्रातायीतीँ३  
तत्प्रातरभवत्समागादितीँ३ तत्सायमभवदहरेव प्राणो रात्रिर-  
पानः । वागग्निश्चक्षुरसावादित्यश्चन्द्रमा मनो दिशः श्रोत्रं स एष  
प्रहितां संयोगोऽध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवत-  
मित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एतच्च स्म वै तद्विद्वानाह हिरण्यदन्वैदो  
न तस्येशे यन्मह्यं न दद्युरिति प्रहितां वा अहमध्यात्मं संयोगं  
निविष्टं वेदैतच्च तत् । अनीशनानि ह वा अस्मै भूतानि बलिं  
हरन्ति य एवं वेद । तत्सत्यं सदिति प्राणस्तीत्यन्वँ<sup>१</sup> यमित्यसा-  
वादित्यस्तदेतत्त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदिव वै चक्षुः शुक्लं कृष्णं क्लीनिकेति ।  
स यदि ह वा अपि मृषा वदति सत्यं हैवास्योदितं भवति य  
एवमेतत्सत्यस्य सत्यत्वं वेद ॥५॥

तस्य वाक्कन्तिर्नामानि दामानि<sup>१</sup> तदस्येदं वाचा तन्या  
नामभिर्दामभिः सर्वे सितं सर्वे हीदं नामनीँ३ सर्वे वाचाभि-

<sup>१</sup> तक्त्यं A; उक्त्यं E, F, उक्त्यं३ G.

<sup>२</sup> यं H, E, with the MSS. See explanatory note.

<sup>३</sup> तीत्यत्रयम् G.

तीत्यत्रयम् D, E

<sup>३</sup> मम् K

<sup>१</sup> दमानि G

वदति । वहन्ति ह वा एनं तनिसंबद्धा य एवं वेद । तस्यो-  
 ष्णिग्लोमानि त्वगायत्री<sup>२</sup> विष्टुर्मांसमनुष्टुप्तावान्यस्थि जगती  
 पङ्क्तिर्मज्जा प्राणो बृहती स छन्दोभिश्छन्दो<sup>३</sup> यच्छन्दोभिश्छन्दस्त-  
 स्माच्छन्दांसीत्याचक्षते । छादयन्ति ह वा एनं छन्दांसि प्रापा-  
 त्कर्मणो यस्यां कस्याञ्चिद्दिशि कामयते य एवमेतच्छन्दां-  
 छन्दस्त्वं वेद । तदुक्तमृषिणा । अपश्यं गोषामित्येष वै गोप्ता  
 एष हीदं सर्वं गोपायति । अनिपद्यमानमिति न ह्येष कदा-  
 चन संविशति । आ च परा च पृथिभिश्चरन्तमित्या च ह्येष  
 परा च पृथिभिश्चरति । स सध्रीचीः स विषूचीर्वसान इति  
 सध्रीचीश्च ह्येष विषूचीश्च वस्त इमा एव दिशः । आ वरीवर्त्ति  
 भुवनेष्वन्तरित्येष ह्यन्तर्भुवनेष्व्वावरीवर्त्ति । अथो आवृतासो  
 ऽवतासो न कर्तुमिरिति । सर्वं हीदं प्राणेनावृतम् । सोऽयमा-  
 काशः प्राणेन बृहत्या विष्टब्धस्तद्यथायमाकाशः प्राणेन बृहत्या  
 विष्टब्ध<sup>४</sup> एवं सर्वाणि भूतान्यापिपीलिकाभ्यः प्राणेन बृहत्या  
 विष्टब्धानीत्येवं<sup>५</sup> विद्यात् ॥६॥

अथातो विभूतयोऽस्य पुरुषस्य । तस्य वाचा सृष्टौ पृथिवी  
 चाग्निश्चास्यामोषधयो जायन्तेऽग्निरेनाः स्वदयतीदमाहरतेदमा-  
 हरतेत्येवमेतौ वाचं पितरं परिचरतः पृथिवी चाग्निश्च । यावदनु  
 पृथिवी यावदन्वग्निस्तावानस्य लोको भवन्ति नास्य तावल्लोको  
 जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते पृथिव्याश्चाग्नेश्च य एवमेतां वाचो

<sup>२</sup> गायत्रीष्टुम् F. <sup>३</sup> छन्दो A. <sup>४</sup> प्राणो न B in text. <sup>५</sup> छन्द A. <sup>६</sup> य B.

<sup>१</sup> एदमाहरते loc F, G.

<sup>२</sup> यावदनु पृथिवी loc F.

विभूतिं वेद । प्राणेन सृष्टावन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं वा अनु  
 चरन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु शृण्वन्ति वायुरस्मै पुण्यं गन्धमावहत्येवमेतौ  
 प्राणं पितरं परिचरतोऽन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्च । यावदन्वन्तरिक्षं  
 यावदनु वायुस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको  
 जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते<sup>१</sup>ऽन्तरिक्षस्य च वायोश्च य एवमेतां  
 प्राणस्य विभूतिं वेद । चक्षुषा सृष्टौ द्यौश्चादित्यश्च द्यौर्हास्मै  
 वृष्टिमन्नाद्यं संप्रयच्छत्यादित्योऽस्य ज्योतिः प्रकाशं करोत्येवमेतौ  
 चक्षुः पितरं परिचरतो द्यौश्चादित्यश्च । यावदनु द्यौर्यावदन्वा-  
 दित्यस्तावानस्य लोको भवति<sup>२</sup> नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते याव-  
 देतयोर्न जीर्यते दिवश्चादित्यस्य च य एवमेतां चक्षुषो विभूतिं  
 वेद । श्रोत्रेण सृष्टा दिशश्च चन्द्रमाश्च दिग्भ्यो हैनमार्यन्ती<sup>३</sup> ३  
 दिग्भ्यो विष्णुणोति चन्द्रमा अस्मै पूर्वपक्षापरपक्षान्विचिनोति  
 पुण्याय कर्मण एवमेते श्रोत्रं पितरं परिचरन्ति दिशश्च चन्द्र-  
 माश्च । यावदनु दिशो यावदनु चन्द्रमास्तावानस्य लोको भवति  
 नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यते दिशां च चन्द्रम-  
 सश्च य<sup>४</sup> एवमेतां श्रोत्रस्य विभूतिं वेद । मनसा सृष्टा आपश्च<sup>५</sup>  
 वरुणश्चापो हास्मै अद्वा संनमन्ते पुण्याय कर्मणे वरुणोऽस्य  
 प्रजां धर्मेण दाधौरैवमेते मनः पितरं परिचरन्त्यापश्च वरुणश्च ।  
 यावदन्वापो यावदनु वरुणस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य  
 तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यतेऽेषां च वरुणस्य च य  
 एवमेतां मनसो विभूतिं वेद ॥७॥

<sup>१</sup> क्षन्ति ६<sup>२</sup> भवति लोको om. ६<sup>३</sup> अती ३ ६<sup>४</sup> य — आपश्च om. F, G.

[आपा३ इत्याप<sup>१</sup> इति तदिदमाप एवेदं वै मूलमदस्तूलमयं  
 पितृते पुत्रा यत्र ह क्व च पुत्रस्य तत्पितुर्यत्र वा पितुस्तद्वा  
 पुत्रस्येत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एतद्ध स वै तद्विद्वानाह महिदास  
 ऐतरेय आह<sup>२</sup> मां देवेभ्यो वेदः श्रो महेवान्वेदेतः प्रदाना ह्येत इतः  
 संभृता इति ] [स एष गिरिश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणस्तं ब्रह्म-  
 गिरिरित्याचक्षते । गिरिति<sup>३</sup> ह वै द्विषन्तं पाप्मानं भ्रातृव्यं  
 परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एषोऽसुः  
 स<sup>४</sup> एष प्राणः स एष भूतिश्चाभूतिश्च ] तं भूतिरिति देवा  
 उपासाञ्चक्रे ते बभूवुस्तस्माद्वाप्येतर्हि सुप्तो भूर्भूतित्वेव प्रश्व-  
 सिति । अभूतिरित्यसुरास्ते ह परावभूवुः । भवत्यात्मना परास्य  
 द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एष मृत्युश्चैवामृतं  
 ४ च [तदुक्तमृषिणा । अपाङ्गाडेति स्वधया गृभीत इत्यपानेन  
 ह्ययं यतः प्राणो<sup>५</sup> न पराङ्गवति । अमर्त्यो<sup>६</sup> मर्त्येना<sup>७</sup> सयोनि-  
 रित्येतेन हीदं सर्वं सयोनि मर्त्यानि हीमानि शरीराणी<sup>८</sup>  
 अमृतैषा देवता । ता शश्वन्ता विषूचीना वियन्ता न्यन्यं चि-  
 क्युर्न नि चिक्युरन्यमिति निचिन्वन्ति हैवेमानि शरीराणी<sup>९</sup>  
 अमृतैर्विषा देवता ] अमृतो ह वा असुषिंल्लोके संभवत्यमृतः  
 सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो ददृशे य एवं वेद य एवं वेद ॥८॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>१</sup>

<sup>१</sup> अप A; at the beginning आपा३: R.

<sup>२</sup> आह E.

<sup>३</sup> गिरिति D, G.

<sup>४</sup> स एष प्राणः om. F.

<sup>५</sup> प्राणेन F.

<sup>६</sup> मर्त्येना D.

<sup>७</sup> चिक्युर् G.

omitting चि.

<sup>८</sup> Text, D, R, इति ऐतरेयारण्यके द्वितीयस्य प्रथमोऽध्यायः A.

## ADHYĀYA 2.

एष इमं लोकमभ्यार्चन्पुरुषरूपेण य एष तपति प्राणो वाव<sup>१</sup> तदभ्यार्चन्प्राणो ह्येष य एष तपति । तं शतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चन्तस्माच्छतं वर्षाणि पुरुषायुषो भवन्ति तं यच्छतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चन्तस्माच्छतर्चिनस्तस्माच्छतर्चिन इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च तस्मान्माध्यमास्तस्मान्माध्यमा<sup>२</sup> इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । प्राणो वै गृत्सोऽपानो मदः स यत्प्राणो<sup>३</sup> गृत्सोऽपानो मदस्तस्माद्गृत्समदस्तस्माद्गृत्समद इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । तस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्यदिदं किञ्च तद्यदस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्यदिदं किञ्च<sup>४</sup> तस्माद्विश्वमित्रस्तस्माद्विश्वमित्र इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तं यद्देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तस्माद्वामदेवस्तस्माद्वामदेव इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽचायत यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽचायत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मादचयस्तस्मादचय इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् ॥१॥<sup>५</sup>

इति द्वितीय आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः K, द्वितीयाख्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः १ F, G, प्रथमोऽध्यायः D .

<sup>१</sup> वावदु F      <sup>२</sup> तस्मान्माध्यमास् om. F, मध्यमास् E      <sup>३</sup> मध्यमा E,  
as in Bṛhaddevata III, 216      <sup>४</sup> प्राणि वै F, प्राणो वै गृत्सो वै गृत्सो G

<sup>५</sup> असीद् E      <sup>६</sup> तद् — किञ्च om. F.      <sup>७</sup> तस्माद्वामदेवस् om. F

<sup>८</sup> Numbered १ in A, E, F, G, H, K, L, 2 in D

एष उ एव विभ्रद्वाजः प्रजा वै वाजस्ता<sup>1</sup> एष विभर्ति यद्वि-  
 भर्ति तस्माद्भ्रद्वाजस्तस्माद्भ्रद्वाज इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् ।  
 तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तं यदेवा अब्रु-  
 वन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तस्माद्वसिष्ठस्तस्माद्वसिष्ठ  
 इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च  
 स यदिदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्प्रगाथास्तस्मात्प्र-  
 गाथा<sup>2</sup> इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत  
 यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्पा-  
 वमान्यस्तस्मात्पावमान्य इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । सोऽब्रवी-  
 दहमिदं सर्वमसानि यच्च क्षुद्रं यच्च महदिति ते क्षुद्रसूक्ताश्चाभव-  
 न्महासूक्ताश्च तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्तास्तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्ता इत्याचक्षत एतमेव  
 सन्तम् । सूक्तं वतावोचतेति तत्सूक्तमभवत्तस्मात्सूक्तं तस्मात्सूक्त-  
 मित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वा ऋगेष ह्येभ्यः सुर्वेभ्यो  
 भूतेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मादृक्तस्मादृ-  
 गित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वा अर्धर्च एष ह्येभ्यः  
 सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मा-  
 दर्धर्चस्तस्मादर्धर्च इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वै पदमेष  
 हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि पादि स यदिमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि  
 पादि तस्मात्पदं तस्मात्पदमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष  
 वा अक्षरमेष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति

<sup>1</sup> तं R in text.<sup>2</sup> प्रागाथाः A, D, E, K.<sup>3</sup> प्रागाथाः D, E, K

pr. man. Both Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 3, and Śākhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, have प्र°.

स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति तस्मा-  
दक्षरं तस्मादक्षरमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । ता वा एताः  
सर्वा ऋचः सर्वे वेदाः सर्वे घोषा एकैव व्याहृतिः प्राण एव  
प्राण ऋच इत्येव विद्यात् ॥२॥<sup>४</sup>

विश्वामिचं ह्येतदहः शंसिष्यन्तमिन्द्र उपनिषसाद<sup>१</sup> । स हान्न-  
मित्यभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय ।  
तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे  
द्वितीयं शंसेति । स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं<sup>२</sup> शशंस  
तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय । तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे  
धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे तृतीयं शंसेति । स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्या-  
हृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय । तमिन्द्र  
उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागा वरं ते ददामीति । स  
होवाच त्वामेव जानीयामिति । तमिन्द्र उवाच प्राणो वा  
अहमस्म्यृषे प्राणस्त्वं प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि प्राणो ह्येष य एष  
तपति स एतेन<sup>३</sup> रूपेण सर्वा दिशो विशोऽस्मि तस्य मेऽन्नं  
मिचं दक्षिणं तद्विश्वामिचमेव तपन्नेवास्मीति होवाच ॥३॥<sup>५</sup>

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य यानि व्यञ्जनानि तच्छ-  
रीरं यो घोषः स आत्मा य ऊष्माणः स प्राणः । एतच्च स्म

<sup>४</sup> Numbered 10 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L; 2 in D.

<sup>१</sup> उपनिषसाद MS B, S

<sup>२</sup> बृहतीसहस्रं E

<sup>३</sup> एतेन F

<sup>५</sup> तद्विद्यामिचम् D

<sup>५</sup> Numbered 11 in A, E, G, H, K, L, 1 in F, 3 in D



वै तद्विद्वान्वसिष्ठो वसिष्ठो बभूव तत एतच्चांमधेयं लेभे । एतदु  
 हैवेन्द्रो विष्णामित्राय प्रोवाचैतदु हैवेन्द्रो भरद्वाजाय प्रोवाच  
 तस्मात्स तेन बन्धुना यज्ञेषु हूयते । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं  
 तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्तिंशतमक्षराणां  
 सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति शतसंवत्सरस्याहं सहस्राणि भवन्ति  
 व्यञ्जनैरेव रात्रीराप्नुवन्ति स्वरैरहानि । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं  
 संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य परस्तात्प्र-  
 ज्ञामयो देवतामयो ब्रह्ममयोऽमृतमयः संभूय देवता अप्येति यः  
 एवं वेद । तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽहम् । तदुक्तमृषिणा ।  
सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्युपस्थेति<sup>१</sup> । एतदु हैवोपेक्षेतीपेक्षेत ॥ ४ ॥<sup>२</sup>

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>३</sup>

### ADHYĀYA 3.

यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुक्तं वेद यस्मादिदं सर्वमु-  
 त्तिष्ठति स संप्रतिवित् । पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योती-  
 षीत्येष वा आत्मोक्तं पञ्चविधमेतस्माद्दीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठत्येतमे-  
 वाप्येति । अयनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं<sup>४</sup> वेद ।

<sup>१</sup> एनम् A ; एतं II in text, no doubt a mistake due to the MSS as often putting  
 ए for an assimilated न before a nasal. Cf. II, 1, 5, यं for यन् <sup>२</sup> य om. F.

<sup>३</sup> स G. <sup>४</sup> Divided च । इति in R. <sup>५</sup> Numbered 12 in A, E, H, K, L;  
 12, 4 in F, G ; 4 in D.

<sup>६</sup> Text, A, L, R ; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये द्वितीयो  
 अध्यायः २ K ; द्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः २ F, G ; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D ;  
 no colophon E.

<sup>७</sup> एवं om. A.

तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चान्नादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नन्नादो जायते भवत्यस्या-  
न्नम् । आपश्च पृथिवी चान्नमेतन्मयानि हान्नानि भवन्ति ज्योतिश्च  
वायुश्चान्नादमेताभ्यां हीदं सर्वमन्नमर्त्यावपनमाकाश आकाशे  
हीदं सर्वं समोष्यते । आवपनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं  
वेद । तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चान्नादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नन्नादो जायते भवत्य-  
स्यान्नम् । ओषधिवनस्पतयोऽन्नं प्राणभृतोऽन्नादमोषधिवन-  
स्पतीन् हि प्राणभृतोऽदन्ति । तेषां य उभयतोदन्ताः पुरुषस्यानु  
विधां<sup>१</sup> विहितास्तेऽन्नादा अन्नमितरे पशवस्तस्मात् इतरान्पशू-  
नधीव चरन्त्यधीव ह्यन्नेऽन्नादो भवति । अधीव ह समानानां  
जायते य एवं वेद ॥१॥<sup>२</sup>

तस्य य आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेदाश्रुते हाविर्भूयः । ओषधिवन-  
स्पतयो यच्च किञ्च प्राणभृत् आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेद । ओषधि-  
वनस्पतिषु हि रसो दृश्यते चित्तं प्राणभृत्सु । प्राणभृत्सु त्वेवावि-  
स्तरामात्मा तेषु हि रसोऽपि दृश्यते न चित्तमितरेषु । पुरुषे  
त्वेवाविस्तरामात्मा स हि प्रज्ञानेन संपन्नतमो विज्ञातं वदति  
विज्ञातं पश्यति वेद श्वस्तनं वेद लोकालोकी सत्येनामृतसी-  
प्तयेवं संपन्नः । अथेतरेषां पशूनामशनापिपासे एवाभिविज्ञानं  
न विज्ञातं वदन्ति न विज्ञातं पश्यन्ति न विदुः श्वस्तनं न  
लोकालोकी त एतावन्तो भवन्ति यथाप्रज्ञं<sup>३</sup> हि संभवाः ॥२॥<sup>४</sup>

<sup>१</sup> ०त्यं R<sup>२</sup> अनुविधा S<sup>३</sup> इतरान् P.<sup>४</sup> Numbered 13 in

A, E, H, K, L, 13, 5 in F, G, 1 in D

<sup>१</sup> आपुत्सु S<sup>२</sup> प्रज्ञा P<sup>३</sup> Numbered 14 in A, E, H, K, L,

14, 2 in F, G, 2 in D

स एष पुरुषः समुद्रः सर्वं लोकमति । यच्च किञ्चाश्रुतेऽत्येनं  
मन्यते यद्यन्तरिक्षलोकमश्रुतेऽत्येनं मन्यते यद्यमुं लोकमश्रुवी-  
तात्येनं मन्येत । स एष पुरुषः पञ्चविधस्तस्य यदुष्णं तज्ज्यो-  
तिर्यानि खानि स आकाशोऽथ यत्सोहितं श्येमा<sup>१</sup> रेतस्ता  
आपो यच्छरीरं सा पृथिवी यः प्राणः स<sup>२</sup> वायुः । स एष  
वायुः पञ्चविधः प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानः समानः<sup>३</sup> । ता  
एता<sup>४</sup> देवताः प्राणापानयोरेव निविष्टाश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वा-  
गिति प्राणस्य ह्यन्वपायमेता अपियन्ति । स एष वाचश्चि-  
क्षस्योत्तरोत्तरिक्रमो यद्यज्ञः । स एष यज्ञः पञ्चविधोऽग्निहोत्रं  
दर्शपूर्णमासौ चातुर्मास्यानि पशुः सोमः । स एष यज्ञानां  
संपन्नतमो यत्सोम एतस्मिन्त्येताः पञ्चविधा अधिगम्यन्ते यत्प्रा-  
क्सवनेभ्यः सैकाविधा त्रीणि सवनानि यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी ॥३॥<sup>५</sup>

यो ह वै यज्ञे यज्ञं वेदाहन्यहर्देवेषु देवमंध्यूहं स संप्रतिवित् ।  
एष वै यज्ञे यज्ञोऽहन्यहर्देवेषु देवोऽध्यूहो यदेतन्महदुक्थम् ।  
तदेतत्पञ्चविधं त्रिवृत्पञ्चदशं सप्तदशमेकविंशं पञ्चविंशमिति  
स्तोमतो गायत्रं रथन्तरं बृहद्ब्रह्मं राजनमिति सामतो गायत्र्यु-  
ष्णिग्वृहती त्रिष्टुप्तिषदेति छन्दस्तः शिरो दक्षिणः पक्ष उत्तरः  
पक्षः पुच्छमात्मेत्याख्यानम् । पञ्चकृत्वः प्रसूति पञ्चकृत्व उद्गा-  
यति पञ्चकृत्वः प्रतिहरति पञ्चकृत्व उपद्रवति पञ्चकृत्वो निध-

<sup>१</sup> यमाय F.<sup>२</sup> श्येमा A. F.<sup>३</sup> स वायुः bis P.<sup>४</sup> समानः bis F.<sup>५</sup> पञ्चवि inserted in G; देवताः om. F.<sup>६</sup> Numbered 15 in A, E, H, K, L;

15, 3 in F, G; 3 in D.

<sup>१</sup> देवं—देवेषु om. F, G.<sup>२</sup> सप्तदश E.

नमुपयन्ति तत्स्रोमसहस्रं भवति । एवं हेताः पञ्च विधा  
अनुशस्यन्ते यत्प्राकृचाशीतिभ्यः सैका विधा तिस्रस्तृचाशीतयो  
यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी । तदेतत्सहस्रं तत्सर्वं तानि दश<sup>१</sup> दशेति वै  
सर्वमेतावंती, हि संख्या दश दशतस्तच्छतं दशशतानि तत्सहस्रं  
तत्सर्वम् । तानि चोणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति चेधा विहितं वा  
इदमन्वमशनं यानं<sup>२</sup> खादस्तदेतराप्नोति ॥४॥

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नम् । तद्धेतदेके नानाछन्दसां सहस्रं  
प्रतिजानते किमन्यत्सदन्यद्व्यामेति । त्रिष्टुप्सहस्रमेकं जगतीस-  
हस्रमेकं ऽनुष्टुप्सहस्रमेकं । तदुक्तमृषिणा । अनुष्टुभमनु चर्चूर्यमा-  
णमिन्द्रं नि चिक्षुः कवयो मनीषेति ॥ वाचि वै तदैन्द्रं प्राणं  
न्यचायन्नित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्ति-  
र्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माह कृत्नो ह्येष  
आत्मा यद्वागभि हि प्राखेन<sup>३</sup> मनसे ऽस्यमानो वाचा नानु-  
भवति । बृहतीमभिसंपादयेदेष वै कृत्न आत्मा यद्बृहती । सो  
ऽयमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरिः परिवृतस्तद्यथायमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरिः  
परिवृत एवमेव बृहती सर्वतश्छन्दोभिः परिवृता । मध्यं ह्येषा-  
मङ्गानामात्मा मध्यं छन्दसां बृहती । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्या-  
णकीर्तिर्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माह कृत्नो-  
ह्येष आत्मा यद्बृहती तस्माद्बृहतीमेवाभिसंपादयेत् ॥५॥

<sup>१</sup> दश om F.<sup>२</sup> यान om F.<sup>३</sup> Numbered 16 in A, E, H, K, L,

15, 4 in F, G, 4 in D

<sup>४</sup> ऐति E.<sup>५</sup> See explanatory notes<sup>६</sup> Numbered 17 in A, E, H, K, L,

17, 5 in F, H, 5 in D.

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं<sup>१</sup> संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य  
 संपन्नस्यैकादशानुष्टुभां शतानि भवन्ति पञ्चविंशतिश्चानुष्टुभ-  
 आन्तं वै भूयसा क्लीयः । तदुक्तमृषिणा । वाचमष्टापदीमहमि-  
 त्यष्टौ हि चतुरक्षराणि भवन्ति । नवसक्तिमिति बृहती संपद्य-  
 माना नवसक्तिः<sup>२</sup> । चतस्पृशमिति सत्यं वै वागृचा स्पृष्टा ।  
 इन्द्रात्परि तत्त्वं मम इति तद्यदेवैतद्बृहतीसहस्रमनुष्टुप्संपन्नं  
 भवति तस्मात्तदैन्द्रात्प्राणाबृहत्यै वाचमनुष्टुभं तत्त्वं संनिर्मिमीते ।  
 स वा एष वाचः परमो<sup>३</sup> विकारो यदेतन्महदुक्तं तदेतत्पञ्चविधं  
 मितममितं स्वरः सत्यानृते इति । ऋग्गाथा कुम्भ्या तन्मितं  
 यजुर्निगदो वृथावाक्तमिति सामाथो यः कथं गेष्णः सः स्वर  
 ओऽमिति सत्यं नेत्यनृतम् । तदेतत्पुष्पं फलं वाचो यत्सत्यं स  
 हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोः पुष्पं हि फलं वाचः  
 सत्यं वदति । अथैतन्मूलं वाचो यदनृतं तद्यथा वृक्ष आविर्मूलः  
 शुष्यति स उद्धर्तत एवमेवानृतं वदन्नाविर्मूलमात्मानं करोति  
 स शुष्यति स उद्धर्तते । तस्मादनृतं न वदेद्दयेत त्वेनेन । पराग्वा  
 एतद्रिक्तमक्षरं यदेतदोऽमिति तद्यत्किञ्चोमित्याहाचैवास्मै तद्वि-  
 च्यते स यत्सर्वमो कुर्याद्रिज्यादात्मानं स कामेभ्यो नालं, स्यात् ।  
 अथैतत्पूर्णमभ्यात्मं यजेति । स यत्सर्वं नेति ब्रूयात्पापिकास्य  
 कीर्तिर्जायेत सैनं<sup>४</sup> तत्रैव हन्यात् । तस्मात्काल एव दद्यात्काले न  
 दद्यात्तत्सत्यानृते मिथुनीकरोति तयोर्मिथुनात्मजायते भूयान्भ-  
 वति । यो वै तां वाचं वेद यस्या एष विकारः स संप्रतिवित् ।

<sup>१</sup> बृहतीसहतीसहस्र F  
 See explanatory notes

<sup>२</sup> So I read for नवसक्ति of the MSS and add

<sup>३</sup> परमो A

<sup>४</sup> समाथो F, G

<sup>५</sup> क्षिप्त F

अकारो वै सर्वा वाक्सैषा स्पर्शोष्मभिर्यज्यमाना बह्वी नाना-  
रूपा भवति । तस्यै यदुपांशु स प्राणोऽथ यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं  
तस्मात्तत्तिर इव तिर इव क्षररीरमशरीरो हि प्राणोऽथ  
यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं<sup>१</sup> तस्मात्तदाविराविर्हि शरीरम् ॥६॥

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यशः स इन्द्रः स भूतानाम-  
धिपतिः । स य एवमेतमिन्द्रं भूतानामधिपतिं वेद विस्रसा  
हैवास्मास्त्रोकाग्रैतीति ह स्माह महिदास ऐतरेयः प्रेत्येन्द्रो  
भूतैषु लोकेषु राजति । तदाहुर्यदनेन रूपेणानुं लोकमभिसं-  
भवती<sup>२</sup> ३ अथ केन रूपेणैमं लोकमाभवती<sup>३</sup> ३ । तद्यदेतत्स्त्रियां  
लोहितं भवत्यग्नेस्तदूर्ध्वं तस्मात्तस्मान्न वीभत्सेताथ यदेतत्पुरुषे  
रेतो भवत्यादित्यस्य तदूर्ध्वं तस्मात्तस्मान्न वीभत्सेत । सोऽयमा-  
त्मेममात्मानममुष्या आत्मने संप्रयच्छत्यसावात्मासुमात्मानमि-  
मस्मा<sup>४</sup> आत्मने संप्रयच्छति तावन्त्योन्यमभिसंभवतोऽनेनाह रूपे-  
णानुं लोकमभिसंभवत्यमुनो रूपेणैमं लोकमाभवति ॥७॥

तत्रैते श्लोकाः ।

यदक्षरं षण्दविधं समेति । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति ।  
सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यच्च युज्यते । तच्च देवाः सर्व एकं भवन्ति ॥९॥

<sup>१</sup> तस्मात् — तच्छरीरम् bis G

<sup>२</sup> Numbered 18 in A, E, H, K, L, 18 7

in F, G, 5 in D

<sup>३</sup> em. G    <sup>४</sup> अभिममक्षै S<sup>12</sup> in text, S<sup>145</sup> = commentary    <sup>५</sup> Numbered

19 in A, E, H, b, L, 19 7 in F, G; 7 in D

यदक्षरादक्षरमेति युक्तम् । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति ।  
सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यच्च युज्यते । तच्च देवाः सर्व एकां भवन्ति ॥२॥

यद्वाच ओमिति यच्च नेति । यच्चास्याः क्रूरं यदु' चोल्ब-  
णिष्णु । तद्वियूया कवयो अन्वविन्दन् । नामायत्ता समतृण-  
ञ्छुतेऽधि' ॥३॥

यस्मिन्नामा समतृणञ्छुतेऽधि' । तच्च देवाः सर्वयुजो भवन्ति ।  
तेन पाप्मानमपहत्य ब्रह्मणा । स्वर्गं लोकमप्येति विद्वान् ॥४॥

नैनं वाचा स्त्रियं ध्रुवन् । नैनमस्त्रीपुमान्ध्रुवन् । पुमांसं न  
ध्रुवन्नेतम् । वदन्वदति कथन ॥५॥

अ' इति ब्रह्म तच्चागतमहमिति । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं  
संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्त्रिंशतमक्ष-  
राणां सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति पुरुषायुषोऽह्नां सहस्राणि  
भवन्ति । जीवाक्षरेणैव जीवाहराप्नोति जीवाह्ना जीवाक्षर-  
मिति । अतकाममारोऽथ देवरथस्तस्य वागुद्भिः' ओचे पक्षसी  
चक्षुषी युक्ते मनः संयहीता तदयं प्राणोऽधितिष्ठति । तदुक्तमृ-  
धिणा । आ तेन यातं मनसो जवीयसा निमिषश्चिज्जवीयसेति  
जवीयसेति ॥६॥

॥ इत्येतेरेयद्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥

१ यदि E.

२ इति F, G.

३ इति F, G.

४ अह D, F, G;

अः K, L, S.

५ वागुद्भि A, E, G.

६ Numbered 20 in A, E, H, K, L;

20, 8 in F, G; 8 in D.

७ Text, A, L; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः K;

द्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति तृतीयोऽध्यायः D; no celophon E.

## ADHYĀYA 4.

आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाय आसीन्नान्यत्किञ्चन मिथत् । स ईक्षत । लोकाच्च सृजा इति । स इमाँल्लोकानसृजत । अम्मो मरीचीर्मरमायः<sup>१</sup> । अदोऽम्भः परेण दिवं, द्यौः प्रतिष्ठान्तरिक्षं मरीचयः, पृथिवी मरो, या अधस्तात्ता आपः । स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका लोकपालाच्च सृजा इति । सोऽह्य एव पुरुषं समुद्धृत्या-मूर्ध्वयत् । तमभ्यतपन्नस्योभितप्रस्य मुखं निरभिद्यत यथायं मुखाद्वाग्वाचोऽग्निः । नसिके निरभिद्येतां नासिकाभ्यां प्राणः प्राणाद्वायुः । अक्षिणी निरभिद्येतामक्षीभ्यां<sup>२</sup> चक्षुषश्चक्षुष आदित्यः । कर्णी निरभिद्येतां कर्णाभ्यां श्रोत्रं श्रोत्राद्दिशः । त्वङ्गिरभिद्यत त्वचो लोमानि लोमभ्य ओषधिवनस्पतयः । हृदयं निरभिद्यत<sup>३</sup> हृदयान्मनो मनसश्चन्द्रमाः । नाभिर्निरभिद्यत नाभ्या अपानोऽपानान्मृत्युः । शिष्टं निरभिद्यत शिष्टादेतो रेतस आपः ॥१॥

ता एता देवताः सृष्टा अस्मिन्महत्पर्यवे प्रापतंस्तमशनापिपासाभ्यामन्ववार्जत् । ता एनमश्रुवन्नायतनं नः प्रजानीहि<sup>४</sup> यस्मि-

<sup>१</sup> मयः Böhlingk. <sup>२</sup> अक्षिभ्यां M, Roer and Bājānā's edd. <sup>३</sup> निरभिद्यत N, निरभिद्येतां corrected into निरभिद्यत M. <sup>४</sup> In the Upanisad, in the MSS and edd of text and Śaṅkara's commentary, in Bājānā and Böhlingk's edd, and differently in T, the Khaṇḍas are subdivided into paragraphs. Śānā's division of sentences is quite different, and as neither division has any authority the numbers are ignored. S, T, Bājānā's ed, and the MSS of Śaṅkara ed. इति प्रथमः खण्डः । Numbered 21 in A, E, H, K, L; 21, 1 in F, G, 1 in D. The Upanisad MSS and edd. all prefix श्रीम्.

<sup>१</sup> अश्रुनायापिपासे T, Bājānā's ed here and below and in Jivānanda's ed. (cited in U as (c)). <sup>२</sup> प्रजानीति P.



प्रतिष्ठिता अन्नमदामेति । ताभ्यो गामानयत्ता अनुवन्न वै  
 नोऽयमलमिति । ताभ्योऽश्वमानयत्ता अनुवन्न वै नोऽयम-  
 लमिति । ताभ्यः पुंरुषमानयत्ता अनुवन्सुकृतं वतेति पुरुषो  
 वाव सुकृतं । ता अब्रवीद्यथायत्नं प्रविशतेति । अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा  
 मुखं प्राविशद्वायुः प्राणो भूत्वा नासिके प्राविशदादित्यश्चक्षु-  
 र्भूत्वाक्षिणी प्राविशद्दिशः श्रोत्रं भूत्वा कर्णौ प्राविशन्नोषधिवन-  
 स्पतयो लोमानि भूत्वा त्वचं<sup>३</sup> प्राविशंश्चन्द्रमा मनो भूत्वा<sup>४</sup> हृदयं  
 प्राविशन्मृत्युरपानो भूत्वा नाभिं प्राविशदापो रेतो भूत्वा शिश्नं  
 प्राविशन् । तमश्नापिपासे अब्रूतामावाभ्यामभिप्रजानीहीति ते  
 अब्रवीदेतास्वेव वां<sup>५</sup> देवतास्वाभजाम्येतासु भागिन्यौ करोमीति ।  
 तस्माद्यस्यै कस्यै च देवतायै हविर्गृह्यते भागिन्यावेवास्यामश-  
 नापिपासे भवतः ॥२॥<sup>६</sup>

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्चान्नमेभ्यः सृजा इति ।  
 सोऽपोऽभ्यतपत्ताभ्योऽभितप्ताभ्यो मूर्तिरजायत । या वै सा  
 मूर्तिरजायतान्नं वै तत् । तदेनत्सृष्टं पराङ्म्यंजिगांसत्तद्वाचाजि-

<sup>३</sup> त्वचं—मूल्या om A, added by Colebrooke with मयसो  
<sup>४</sup> मपि Böhtlingk <sup>५</sup> वा N, Rör and Rājārāma's edd <sup>६</sup> Numbered 22  
 in A, F, H, K, L, 22, 2 in I, G, 2 in D; इति द्वितीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS of  
 Sukhara, in smaller print in Rājārāma's ed

<sup>१</sup> सोमो A. <sup>२</sup> तदेतदमिष्टं M, T, Jivānanda's ed, तदत्तं U (one MS. An).  
 In Saṅkara's comm, Jivānanda's ed, and five MSS of U (An, AAs, ga, cha; ja) have  
 'तत् Three MSS. of U in Ānandaśrītha's *śukā* here and two on p. 42, note 3, have  
 'तत्. Rājārāma and Rör read तदेतदमिष्टं नदत्, and clearly this is what T had  
 in view. The नदत् is not recognized in the commentaries, and seems a later addition  
 to the text. Böhtlingk reads 'देतत्. <sup>३</sup> So Böhtlingk for 'पां' of MSS and edd.

घृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोवाचा ग्रहीतुम्<sup>४</sup> । स यद्धैनवाचाग्रहैषदभिप्राह्य  
 हैवान्नमचप्स्यत् । तत्प्राणेनाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोत्प्राणेन ग्रहीतुम् ।  
 स यद्धैनत्प्राणेनाग्रहैषदभिप्राण्य हैवान्नमचप्स्यत् । तच्चक्षुषाजि-  
 घृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्चक्षुषा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनच्चक्षुषाग्रहैषदृष्ट्वा हैवा-  
 न्नमचप्स्यत् । तच्छ्रोत्रेणाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्छ्रोत्रेण ग्रहीतुम् । स  
 यद्धैनच्छ्रोत्रेणाग्रहैषच्छ्रुत्वा हैवान्नमचप्स्यत् । तत्स्वचाजिघृक्षत्त-  
 न्नाशक्नोस्वचा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनस्वचाग्रहैषत्स्पृष्ट्वा हैवान्न-  
 मचप्स्यत् । तन्मनसाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोन्मनसा ग्रहीतुम् । स  
 यद्धैनन्मनसाग्रहैषद्वात्वा हैवान्नमचप्स्यत् । तच्छिघ्रेनाजिघृक्ष-  
 त्तन्नाशक्नोच्छिघ्रेन ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनच्छिघ्रेनाग्रहैषद्विसृज्य  
 हैवान्नमचप्स्यत् । तदपानेनाजिघृक्षत्तदावेयत् । सैषोऽन्नस्य  
 ग्रहो यद्वायुरन्नायुर्वा एष यद्वायुः । स ईक्षत कथं न्विदं मदृते  
 स्यादिति । स ईक्षत कतरेण प्रपद्या इति । स ईक्षत यदि  
 वाचाभिप्राहृतं यदि प्राणेनाभिप्राणितं यदि चक्षुषा दृष्टं यदि  
 श्रोत्रेण श्रुतं यदि त्वचा स्पृष्टं यदि मनसा ध्यातं यद्यपानेना-  
 भ्यपानितं यदि शिघ्रेण विसृष्टमथ<sup>५</sup> कोऽहमिति । स एतमेव  
 सीमानं विदर्यंतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत । सैषा विदृतिर्नाम द्वास्त-  
 ॥ देतन्नान्दनम् [तस्य चय आवसथास्तयः स्वप्ना] अयमावसथो  
 ऽयमावसथोऽयमावसथ इति । स जातो भूतान्यभिव्यक्ष-  
 त्किमिहान्यं वावदिषदिति । स एतमेव पुरुषं ब्रह्म<sup>६</sup> ततममप-

<sup>४</sup> ग्रहीतुम् and so infra T. Böhtlingk reads ग्रहीष्यद् throughout. <sup>५</sup> हेतव् T, Rör, Benares ed. <sup>६</sup> जिघृषत्—शिघ्रेण Sar N. <sup>७</sup> स एषो T, Rör, Benares ed.

<sup>८</sup> अथ T, om. Rājārāma. <sup>९</sup> विधृतिर T. <sup>१०</sup> क्षिपत् T, Rör, Böhtlingk;

क्षिप्यत् rest, विव\* Delhiuck; वाव दिषेत् Böhtlingk. <sup>११</sup> S prints as ब्रह्मततमम्  
 against Sakara and Sajana.

श्यत् । इदमदर्शमिती<sup>३</sup> । तस्मादिदं नानेदं ह वै नाम  
तमिदं सन्तमिन्द्र<sup>१३</sup> इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण । परोक्षप्रिया<sup>१४</sup> इव हि  
देवाः । परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवाः ॥३॥<sup>१५</sup>

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>१६</sup>

### ADHYAYA 5

पुरुषे<sup>१</sup> ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति । यदेतद्रेतस्तदेत-  
त्सर्वेभ्योऽङ्गेभ्यस्तेजः संभूतमात्मन्येवात्मानं विभर्ति तद्यदा स्त्रियां  
सिञ्चत्यथैनं जनयति । तदस्य प्रथमं जन्म<sup>२</sup> । तस्त्रिया आत्मभूयं  
गच्छति यथा स्वमङ्गं तथा । तस्मादेनां न हिनस्ति । सास्यैत-  
मात्मानमच गतं भावयति सा भावयित्री भावयितव्या भवति ।

<sup>३</sup> इति M Boer and Rājārāma, श्री ३ म Bohllangh but cf II, 3, 7, &c <sup>१३</sup> मद्र-  
मित्य<sup>१३</sup> Boer <sup>१४</sup> पारोक्ष F <sup>१५</sup> Numbered 23 in A, E, F, II R, L, 23 3  
in G, 3 in D इति तृतीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS of Sakara <sup>१६</sup> So A,  
L R, द्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः F, G, इति चतुर्थोऽध्यायः D, इति श्री ऐतरे-  
योपनिषद् चतुर्थोऽध्यायः समाप्तः ॥४॥ N, इत्यितरेये द्वितीये चतुर्थं. M, no colo-  
phon E, इत्यितरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः । उपनिषत्सु प्रथमोऽध्यायः ।  
श्री तत्सत्. T, इति द्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः K Rājārāma follows T, correcting  
द्वितीये into \*य

<sup>१</sup> Before पुरुषे, अपक्रामन्तु यमिन्धः is inserted in A, E, F, G, h, L N, R, S<sup>१-३</sup>, U  
But though old the words cannot be original, and are not recognized by Śāyana or  
Sakara <sup>२</sup> इतस्त्व<sup>२</sup> and A <sup>३</sup> इदेतद् and J <sup>४</sup> सर्वेभ्यः T

<sup>५</sup> समृत T, Rājārāma's ed - <sup>६</sup> धेत्य T, Boer, Rājārāma and J. Landa's edd.,  
and two MSS (ka, kha) cited in U, धेतं Bohllangh <sup>७</sup> इति प्रथमः खण्डः T,  
This must be due to a mistaken idea that the 1st colophon (see p 15) means that  
there are four khandas in this Adhyāya, whereas it really means that this is the fourth  
khaṇḍa of the whole Upaniṣad After भावयति it has ॥४॥ treating this as a new  
khaṇḍa

तं स्त्री गर्भे विभर्ति सोऽय<sup>8</sup> एव कुमारं जन्मनोऽयेऽधिभावं-  
यति । स यत्कुमारं जन्मनोऽयेऽधिभावयत्यात्मानमेव तद्भावं-  
यति । एषां लोकानां संतत्या एवं संतता हीमे लोकाः ।  
तदस्य द्वितीयं जन्म<sup>10</sup> । सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः कर्मभ्यः  
प्रतिधीयते । अथास्यायमितर आत्मा कृतकृत्यो वयोगतः प्रैति ।  
स इतः प्रयत्नेव पुनर्जायते । तदस्य तृतीयं जन्म । तदुक्तमृ-  
षिणा<sup>11</sup> । गर्भे नु सर्वेन्वेषामवेदमहं देवानां जनिमानि विश्वा ।  
शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्षन्नाथ श्येनो जवसा निरदीयमिति ॥  
गर्भे एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच<sup>12</sup> । स एवं विद्वानस्मा-  
च्छरीरभेदादूर्ध्वं उत्क्रम्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वा-  
मृतः समभवत्समभवात्<sup>13</sup> ।

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>16</sup>

<sup>8</sup> om Döbblingk

<sup>9</sup> तद् om N.

<sup>10</sup> ॥ २ ॥ इति द्वितीयः खण्डः T.

<sup>11</sup> प्रतिनिधीयते T. This is an obvious error, and is borrowed from Śaṅkara's com-  
mentary.

<sup>12</sup> ॥ १ ॥ इति तृतीयः खण्डः T.

<sup>13</sup> गर्भे नु सन्नुक् I, S has 'प्रथमः'

om have U, Röer, Benares, and Rājārāma's add.

<sup>14</sup> ॥ १ ॥ T.

<sup>15</sup> ॥ २ ॥ T.

T continues इति चतुर्थः खण्डः ॥ ४ ॥ and so S, U, and MSS of Śaṅkara. Numbered  
24 in A, B, H, K, L; 24, 7 in F, G, not numbered in D, numbered 24 in R.  
Before the number, A, S<sup>4-9</sup>, Benares ed (somewh 1941), and U insert यथास्मान्  
नु (om. U) गर्भिन्ः. See on II, 6. The words are not recognized by Śaṅkara  
or Sūyaga, and cannot be genuine.

<sup>16</sup> Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके

पञ्चमोऽध्यायः A; इति द्वितीय आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय आरण्यके  
पञ्चमोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः D; no  
colophon E; इति ऐतरेये पञ्चमः M; इत्यितरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ।  
उपनिषत्सु द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । ओ तत्सत् T; 4 only N. Rājārāma has इत्यितरेयारण्यके  
and then as in T.

## ADHYĀYA 6

[कोऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे कतरः स आत्मा । येन वाः पश्यति येन वाः शृणोति येन वा गन्थानाजिघ्रति येन वा वाचं व्याकरोति येन वा स्वादु चास्वादु च विजानाति । यदेतद्दृढं मनश्चेतत्संज्ञानमाज्ञानं विज्ञानं प्रज्ञानं मेधाः दृष्टिर्धृतिर्मतिर्मनीषा जूतिः स्मृतिः संकल्पः क्रतुरमुः कामो वश इति । सर्वाण्येवैतानि प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि भवन्ति]॥ एषः ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र एष प्रजापतिरेते सर्वे देवा इमानि च पञ्च महाभूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतीर्धीत्येतानीमानि च क्षुद्रमिच्छाणीव बीजानीतराणि चेताराणि<sup>४</sup> चारुजानि<sup>५</sup> च स्वेदजानि चोद्भिज्जानि<sup>१०</sup> चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यत्किञ्चेदं प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतचि च यच्च स्यावरं सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञानेचं<sup>११</sup> प्रज्ञाने प्रतिष्ठितं प्रज्ञानेचो<sup>१२</sup> लोकः प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा प्रज्ञानं<sup>१३</sup> ब्रह्म । स एतेन<sup>१४</sup> प्रज्ञेनात्मनास्माँल्लोकादुत्क्र-

<sup>१</sup> यथास्मान् तु गर्भिन्य is here inserted in R. It is omitted by D E F G, H I L, N T, and in Sitarāma's text, and by Hoer and Rajārāma. See on II<sup>५</sup> यमः Max Muller and Böhlingk. <sup>२</sup> रूप inserted in T in Hoer, Jivananda and Rajārāma's edd. It is clearly borrowed from Śaṅkara's commentary.

<sup>३</sup> शब्दान inserted in T. शब्द in Hoer, Jivananda and Rajārāma's edd.

<sup>४</sup> दृष्टिर् F स्मृति om Benares ed. <sup>५</sup> स added in T. <sup>७</sup> बीजानित

राणि I. <sup>८</sup> चक्षुष्याणि A. <sup>९</sup> जाचि only F. वरायुः Böhlingk.

<sup>१०</sup> The spelling with two j's is supported by I M, T U, Rajārāma and Sitarāma's edd. against Benares ed., R and S. <sup>११</sup> प्रज्ञानेच om F G. <sup>१२</sup> प्रज्ञानेचि D.

<sup>१३</sup> प्रज्ञान ब्रह्म om I. <sup>१४</sup> एतेनैव T.

म्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वामृतः समभवत्सम-  
भवत्<sup>15</sup> ॥

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>16</sup>

॥ इति द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

This ends the second Āranyaka, but the majority of the MSS. of the text, and of Sāyana's commentary, and of Ānandatīrtha's own commentary, and his *ākāśa*, add a seventh Adhyāya, which is:—

#### ADHYĀYA 7.

वाङ्मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता मनो मे वाचि प्रतिष्ठिताविरा-  
वीर्मे एधि वेदस्य म आणी स्थः श्रुतं मे मा प्रहासीरन्तेनाधी-  
तेनाहोराचांस्संदधाम्यृतं वदिष्यामि सत्यं वदिष्यामि<sup>1</sup> तन्मामवतु  
तद्वक्तारमवतवतु मामवतु वक्तारमवतु वक्तारम् ॥

॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>2</sup>

<sup>15</sup> इति पद्यमः खण्डः ॥५॥ T, U, MSS of Śaṅkara; numbered 25 in A, E, H, K, L, not numbered in D, F, G, 5 in N <sup>16</sup> Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥६॥ A, इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः L, इति द्वितीय आरण्ये षष्ठोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः F, G, इति षष्ठोऽध्यायः D, M; no colophon in E, N; इति ऐतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः । उपनिषत्सु द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । श्रीं तत्सत् । T. L adds द्वितीयारण्यके समाप्त । Tāpārāma's ed. begins इत्यितरेयारण्यके, and then = T

<sup>1</sup> 'विराविर्मे' K, see on I, 1, 1, in the Śāntimantra, Egging, *Indica Office Catalogue*, p 117.

<sup>2</sup> प्रहासीदु T, and Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda* <sup>3</sup> वादिष्या A here.

<sup>4</sup> 'मा३म् D <sup>5</sup> This occurs in A, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, N, O, Q, R, S, T, U.

At R; however, it is placed at the beginning of the 31st mantra, and at R it is the end of Āranyaka V, and see also note on I, 1, 1. It does not occur in most MSS of

Saṅkara's commentary, and it is omitted even in I<sub>4</sub>, which is a complete MS of all the text. It appears clearly not to have been known to Saṅkara. It is, however, known to Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary in the MSS, II and O. In the edition, U, of Ānandatīrtha's commentary on Saṅkara, it is said: षष्ठ्यष्टस्य भाष्यं स्रष्टत्वादात्मतत्वाप्रतिपादनाच्च श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्येण कृतमित्येतदुक्तान् एव ज्ञायते । सा तु टीका दीपिकातोऽभिज्ञेवेति ज्ञात्वा च न संगृहीता । M, N, Q, and apparently Max Muller's MS., § B E. I, 246, n 2, have एवं षष्ठेऽध्याये तत्त्वविद्या परिसमाप्य सप्तमे (so N, Q, सप्तमं श्रीमत्परिव्राजकाचार्य add M) शान्तिकरी मन्त्रः पठितः वाङ्मो मनसोत्थादि । तस्य स्रष्टार्यत्वादात्मतत्वाप्रतिपादकत्वाच्च भाष्यकरिणं व्याख्यातः । स मन्त्रानां बोधाय दीपिकाकारोक्तरीत्या व्याख्यायति । पद्योक्तं &c, exactly as in Śāyana's commentary. The end is इति श्रीसप्तमाध्यायस्य दीपिका संपूर्णा M, इति सप्तमाध्यायदीपिका समाप्ता N. The question arises whether this wholesale borrowing was due to Ānandatīrtha or not. On the whole the evidence is against the view that it was. (a) It compels us to date Ānandatīrtha after Śāyana, which is (a) contradictory to the accepted dates of either writer, and (b) cannot be reconciled with the fact that Śāyana sometimes follows Ānandatīrtha closely in his commentary, cf. on II, 4, 3. (2) It is of course clear from the consensus of MS evidence that the explanation of the last section was added at a comparatively early date to Ānandatīrtha's commentary, but this could easily have happened, and as a matter of fact the alteration needed to introduce the extract was very slight, as Śāyana begins षष्ठे तत्त्वविद्या परिसमाप्य सप्तमे शान्तिकरं मन्त्रं पठति । वाङ्मो मनसोत्ति । The addition was very natural, since the fact that the Adhyāya is recognized by Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary shows that it had already in his time become a recognized part of the Āranyaka. In Jones' MS (Tawney and Thomas Catalogue of Two Collections of Sanskrit MSS, p 2) we have the commentary of Saṅkara without the pad, followed by 'Mādhava's' commentary as in the edition. After II, 7, II continues हरिः श्रीः । अथातस्संहिताया उपनिषत् । वाङ्मो मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता । खीऽयमादिति वयमुपासहे । पुरुषे ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति । स ईक्षते नु लोकाय लोकपासाय । ता एता देवतास्मृष्टाः । आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाय आसीत् । तत्रैते लोकाः । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यज्ञस्य इन्द्रः । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तदेतदेके । यो ह वै यज्ञे यज्ञं वेद । स एष पुरुषस्समुद्रः । तस्य य आत्मानमाविश्वरा वेद । यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुत्कर्षं वेद । तदा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य याचि ब्रह्मणानि । विद्यामिदं ह्येतदहस्यसिष्यन्तम् । एष च एष विध्वजः । एष इदं लोकाभ्यार्चयत् । आपाः इति आप इति । अथातो

विभूतयोऽस्य पुष्टयस्य । तस्य चाक्तनिर्नामानि दामानि । त देवाः प्राशयन्त तं  
 प्रपदान्या प्रापयत । अथातो रेतसस्मृष्टिः । उक्थमुक्थमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति । एष पन्था  
 एतत्कर्त्तुं । एष पन्था अष्टौ । एष दमस्तत्वारि । यो ह वा आत्मानमष्टौ । आत्मा वै  
 चयः । पुष्टय एका । कोऽयमेका । वाङ्म एका । एष पन्था विश्वामिशं ह्यात्मा -  
 वै वद । हरिः श्री । इति द्वितीयारण्य समाप्तम् । The other MSS end as follows  
 ॥ २६ ॥ इत्यितरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः । द्वितीयारण्यक समाप्त । A, ॥ २६ ॥  
 इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥ ७ ॥ इति द्वितीयमारण्यक समाप्त । F, ॥ २६ ॥ ४ ॥ (rest as in  
 F) G, इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः द्वितीयारण्यः D, ॥ २६ ॥ इति द्वितीय आरण्ये सप्तमो-  
 ऽध्यायः । समाप्तः K B ends as in text, but with समाप्तः added



## ॥ अथ तृतीयारण्यकम् ॥

## ADHYĀYA 1.

‘अथातः’ संहिताया’ उपनिषत् । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तर-  
रूपं वायुः संहितेति माण्डूकेय आकाशः संहितेत्यस्य माण्डूके-  
वेदयाञ्चक्रे । स हाविपरिहृतो मेने न मेऽस्य पुत्रेण समगा-  
दिति । समाने चै तत्परिहृतो मेन इत्यागस्त्यः समानं ह्येतद्भवति  
वायुश्चाकाशश्च<sup>१</sup> । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । वाक्पूर्वरूपं  
मन उत्तररूपं प्राणः संहितेति<sup>२</sup> शूरवीरो<sup>३</sup> माण्डूकेयः । अथ  
‘ह्यस्य पुत्र आह ज्येष्ठी मनः पूर्वरूपं वागुत्तररूपं मनसा’ वा  
अये संकल्पयत्यथ वाचा व्याहरति तस्मान्मन एव पूर्वरूपं  
वागुत्तररूपं प्राणस्त्वेव संहितेति । ‘समानमेनयोरथ पितुश्च  
पुत्रस्य च । स एषोऽश्वरथः प्रष्टिवाहनो मनोवाक्प्राणसंहतः’ ।  
स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया<sup>४</sup> पशुभिर्व्यशसा  
ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । इति नु माण्डूके-  
यानाम् ॥१॥

अथ. शाकल्यस्य । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तररूपं वृष्टिः संधिः  
पर्जन्यः संधाता । तदुतापि यच्चैतद्वलवदनुद्ब्रह्मन्संदधदहोरात्रे

<sup>१</sup> संहिताय B. <sup>२</sup> च only, B, B, &c, चेति S. <sup>३</sup> संहिते A. <sup>४</sup> भूरो  
वीरो E. <sup>५</sup> मगसिवायि B. <sup>६</sup> संहितः B; संहिनुतः E. <sup>७</sup> प्रजय B.

<sup>१</sup> गू B, S, &c.; corr. Bohlingk; cf. Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 2.

वर्पति द्यावापृथिव्यौ समधातामित्युताण्याहुः । इती<sup>१</sup> न्वधिदै-  
वतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुषो ह वा अयं सर्व आनन्दं द्वे विदले  
भवत इत्याहुस्तस्येदमेव पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवस्तत्रायमन्तरे-  
णाकाशे यथासौ द्यावापृथिव्यावन्तरेणाकाशः । तस्मिन्हांसि-  
न्नाकाशे प्राण आयतो यथामुष्मिन्नाकाशे वायुरायतः । यथा-  
मूनि चीणि ज्योतीष्येवमिमानि पुरुषे चीणि<sup>२</sup> ज्योतीषि  
यथासौ दिव्यादित्य एवमिदं<sup>३</sup> शिरसि चक्षुर्यथासावन्तरिक्षे  
विद्युदेवमिदमात्मनि हृदयं यथायमग्निः पृथिव्यामेवमिदमुपस्ये  
रेतः । एवमु ह स्म सर्वलोकमात्मानमनुविधायाहेदमेव  
पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवः । स य एवमेतां संहितां<sup>४</sup> वेद  
संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्गणसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन  
सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥

[अथातो निर्भुजप्रवादाः । पृथिव्यायतनं निर्भुज दिव्यायतनं  
प्रतृणमन्तरिक्षायतनमुभयमन्तरेण । अथ यद्येनं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्त-  
मुपवदेदच्योष्टावराभ्या<sup>५</sup> स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनं  
प्रतृणं ब्रुवन्तमुपवदेदच्योष्टा उत्तराभ्यां स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् ।  
यस्त्वैवोभयमन्तरेणाह तस्य नास्त्युपवादः । यद्धि संधि विवर्त-  
यति तन्निर्भुजस्य रूपमथ यच्छुद्धे अक्षरे अभिव्याहरति तत्प्र-  
तृणस्याय उ एवोभयमन्तरेणोभयं व्याप्तं भवति]

<sup>१</sup> इति S<sup>१२५</sup><sup>२</sup> विवस् १ वस् F<sup>४</sup> So I read for तस्मिन्हक्षिणं B

G H K L S तस्मिन्नाकाशे F तस्मिन्नक्षिन्नाकाशे A R यथा—वायुर lost in B

<sup>५</sup> चीणि—एद lost in B<sup>६</sup> एवमिदमु lost in B<sup>७</sup> संहितां B, सप्त F<sup>१</sup> एव आभ्या B

निर्भुजं ब्रूयात्स्वर्गकामः प्रतृणमुभयकाम उभयमन्तरेण । अथ  
यद्येतं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेत्पृथिवीं देवतामारः पृथिवी त्वा  
देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येतं प्रतृणं ब्रुवन्तं पर उप-  
वदेद्दिवं<sup>२</sup> देवतामारो<sup>३</sup> द्यौस्त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ  
यद्येतमुभयमन्तरेण ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेदन्तरिक्षं<sup>४</sup> देवतामारो  
ऽन्तरिक्षं त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु कथा च  
ब्रुवन्वा<sup>५</sup> ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमेव यत्तथा स्यात् । न त्वेवान्य-  
त्कुशलाद्वाक्ष्यं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न<sup>६</sup> एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् ।  
नातिद्युम्ने च न ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो<sup>७</sup> अस्तु ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह  
स्नाह शूरवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥३॥

अथातोऽनुष्याहाराः । प्राणो वंश इति विद्यात् । स य एनं  
प्राणं वंशमुपवदेच्छक्रुवच्चेन्मन्येत प्राणं<sup>८</sup> वंशं समधाँ<sup>९</sup> प्राणं  
मा वंशं संदधत् न शक्नोषीत्याह प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं  
ब्रूयात् । अथ चेदशक्रुवन्तं<sup>१०</sup> मन्येत प्राणं वंशं समधित्तिषं तं  
नाशकः संधातुं प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु  
कथा च ब्रुवन्वा<sup>५</sup> ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमेव यत्तथा स्यात् । न  
त्वेवान्यत्कुशलाद्वाक्ष्यं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् ।

<sup>२</sup> ऋषति B<sup>३</sup> देदिव I, G<sup>४</sup> देवतामारी A.<sup>५</sup> नंसु B.<sup>६</sup> उपवदवदेद्र A<sup>७</sup> अन्तरिक्षं देवतामारो om L, अन्तरीक्षं

B in text

<sup>८</sup> See explanatory notes<sup>९</sup> अतिद्युम्ने—ब्रूयान् om. F, G<sup>१०</sup> नमो शु B<sup>१</sup> चिन् om II<sup>२</sup> प्राणवंशं B:<sup>३</sup> समधाँ A, B<sup>४</sup> ऋषति B.<sup>५</sup> See explanatory notes on III, 1, 3<sup>६</sup> अभ्याशम् B, E (yet correctly in III, 1, 4)

नातिद्युम्ने' चन ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो अस्तु<sup>१</sup> ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह  
स्माह श्रूवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥४॥

अथ खल्वाहुर्निर्भुजवक्त्राः । पूर्वमक्षरं<sup>१</sup> पूर्वरूपमुत्तरमुत्तर-  
रूपं योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण सा संहितेति । स  
य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया<sup>२</sup> पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्म-  
वर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । अथ वयं ब्रूमो निर्भु-  
जवक्त्रा इति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः पूर्वमेवाक्षरं पूर्वरूपमु-  
त्तरमुत्तररूपं योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण येन संधिं  
विवर्तयति येन स्वरास्वरं<sup>३</sup> विजानाति येन माचामाचां विभ-  
जते सा संहितेति । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया<sup>४</sup>  
पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । अथ  
हास्य पुनः<sup>५</sup> आह मध्यमः प्राचीवोधीपुनोऽक्षरे खल्विमे अवि-  
कर्पन्ननेकीकुर्वन्पथावर्णमाह तद्यासौ माचा पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे  
अन्तरेण संधिविज्ञपनी साम तज्ज्वति सामैवाहं संहितां मन्य  
इति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । बृहस्पते न परः साम्नो<sup>६</sup> विदुरिति ॥  
स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्म-  
वर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ॥५॥

<sup>१</sup> भाद्युक्ते A

<sup>२</sup> मनो जु B

<sup>३</sup> पूर्वरूपम् F

<sup>४</sup> रूपम् only B

<sup>५</sup> प्रजयाः B (with *prajamāyā* as usual)

<sup>६</sup> उत्तरम् om G

<sup>७</sup> स्वरा स्वर A, K, L, स्वरास्वर B

<sup>८</sup> पुन आह om B

<sup>९</sup> प्राचीवोधी B

<sup>१०</sup> नेकीकुर्वन् B

<sup>११</sup> अवि—प्रज lost in B

<sup>१२</sup> साम्ना G

<sup>१३</sup> सर्वमायुरे lost in B

बृहद्रथन्तरं यो रूपेण संहिता संधीयत इति तारुह्यः<sup>१</sup> । वाग्वै  
 रथन्तरस्य रूपं प्राणो बृहत उभाभ्यामु खलु संहिता संधीयते  
 वाचा च प्राणेन च । एतस्यां ह सोपनिषदि संवत्सरं गा रक्ष-  
 यते तारुह्यः<sup>२</sup> । एतस्यां<sup>३</sup> ह स माचायां संवत्सरं गा रक्षयते  
 तारुह्यः । तदप्येतदृषिणीकृतम् । रथन्तरमा जभारा वसिष्ठो भर-  
 द्वाजो बृहदा चक्रे अग्नेरिति ॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते  
 प्रजया<sup>४</sup> पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ।  
 वाक्प्राणेन संहितेति<sup>५</sup> कौण्डरय्यः प्राणः पवमानेन पवमानो  
 विश्वेदेवैर्विश्वे देवाः स्वर्गेण लोकेन स्वर्गो लोको ब्रह्मणा  
 सैषावरपरा संहिता । स यो हैतामवरपरां संहितां वेदैव हिव  
 स प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन संधीयते<sup>६</sup>  
 यथैषा संहिता । ॥ यदि परेण वोपमृतः<sup>७</sup> स्वेन वार्धेनाभि-  
 व्याहरेदभिव्याहार्धत्वेन विद्याद्विवं संहितागमद्विदुषां देवानामेवं  
 भविष्यतीति । शश्वत्तया स्यात् । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद  
 संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन<sup>८</sup>  
 सर्वमायुरेति । वाक्संहितेति पञ्चालचराडः । वाचा वै वेदाः  
 संधीयन्ते वाचा छन्दांसि वाचा मित्राणि संदधति वाचा  
 सर्वाणि भूतान्यथो वागेवेदं सर्वमिति । तद्यच्चैतदधीते वा भाषते

<sup>१</sup> तारुह्यः B, D, H, S (but S<sup>1346</sup> has तारुह्यः).

incorrect), H, D, H, S (but not S<sup>345</sup>)

<sup>२</sup> एतस्या—तद् om. B; तारुह्यः A;  
 तारुह्यः D, H, L (elsewhere तारुह्यः), S (but not S<sup>34579</sup>)

om. F.

<sup>३</sup> त्रिदु B.

<sup>४</sup> प्रजयः B

<sup>५</sup> वाक्च L.

<sup>६</sup> संहिते B.

<sup>७</sup> संधीयते—लोकेन om. F, G.

<sup>८</sup> संधीयते B.

व्याहार्धं नेत्येव R in text, वि विद्यात् K, read perhaps \*हरत्त\*.

वा वाचि तदा प्राणो भवति वाक्त्वा प्राणं रेळ्ळ्यथ यच्च तूष्णीं  
 वा<sup>11</sup> भवति स्वपिति वा<sup>12</sup> प्राणे तदा वाग्भवति प्राणस्तदा  
 वाचं रेळ्ळि तावन्त्योन्यं रेळ्ळो वाग्वै माता प्राणः पुत्रः । तदप्ये-  
 तदृषिणोक्तम् । एकः सुपर्णः स समुद्रमा विवेश स इदं विश्वं  
 भुवनं वि चष्टे । तं पाकेन मनसापश्यमन्तितस्तं<sup>13</sup> माता रेळ्ळि  
 स उ रेळ्ळि मातरमिति ॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते  
 प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ।  
 अथातः प्रजापतिसंहिता । जाया पूर्वरूपं पतिरुत्तररूपं पुत्रः  
 संधिः प्रजननं संधानं सैषादिति<sup>14</sup> संहिता । अदितिर्हीदं सर्वं  
 यदिदं किञ्च पिता च माता च पुत्रश्च प्रजननं च । तदप्येतदृषि-  
 णोक्तम् । अदितिर्माता स पिता स पुत्र इति ॥ स य एवमेतां  
 संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया<sup>15</sup> पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण  
 लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति सर्वमायुरेति ॥ ६ ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>17</sup>

#### ADIMĀLA 2.

प्राणो वंश इति स्थविरः शकल्यः । तद्यथा शालावंशे सर्वे  
 ऽन्ये वंशाः समाहिताः स्युरेवमस्मिन्प्राणे चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो

<sup>11</sup> वाग् B      <sup>12</sup> वा om A, वाक् G      <sup>13</sup> तस्मा B, मात D      <sup>14</sup> स  
 सैषादि\* B      <sup>15</sup> प्रजयः B, which also has *gda* for *ta*,      <sup>17</sup> Text A (with  
 समाप्तः), B. इत्युग्वेदसंहितारण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः B, तृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः F,  
 तृतीय आरण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः G, इति तृतीय आरण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः K, इति  
 चणोदशोऽध्यायः L, प्रथमोऽध्यायः D, no copy from E.

<sup>1</sup> एतस्मिन् B.

वाग्निन्द्रियाणि शरीरं सर्वं आत्मा समाहितः । तस्यैतस्यात्मनः  
 प्राण ऊष्मरूपमस्थीनि स्पर्शरूपं मज्जानः स्वरूपं मांसं  
 लोहितमित्येतदन्यच्चतुर्थमन्तस्थारूपमिति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो मा-  
 शदूकेयः । चयं त्वेव न<sup>१</sup> एतत्प्रोक्तम् । तस्यैतस्य चयस्यास्था<sup>२</sup>  
 मज्जां पर्वणामिति चीणीतः<sup>३</sup> षष्टिशतानि चीणीतस्तानि सप्त  
 विंशतिशतानि<sup>४</sup> भवन्ति सप्त च वै शतानि विंशतिश्च<sup>५</sup> संवत्स-  
 रस्याहोरात्राः । स एषोऽहःसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो  
 मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतमहःसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं  
 श्रोत्रमयं<sup>६</sup> छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाहं सायुज्यं  
 सरूपतां सलोकतामप्नुते पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥१॥<sup>७</sup>

अथ कीदृशव्यः । चीणि षष्टिशतान्यक्षराणां चीणि षष्टि-  
 शतान्यूपमणां चीणि षष्टिशतानि संधीनाम् । यान्यक्षराण्यवो-  
 चामाहानि तानि यान्यूपमणोऽवोचाम<sup>८</sup> रात्रयस्ता यान्संधीनं वो-  
 चामाहोरात्राणां ते संधय इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । यान्य-  
 क्षराण्यधिदैवतमवोचामास्थीनि तान्यध्यात्मम् । यान्यूपमणो  
 ऽधिदैवतमवोचाम मज्जानस्तेऽध्यात्मम् । एष ह वै संप्रति-  
 प्राणो यन्मज्जैतद्रेतो न ह वा ऋते<sup>९</sup> प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्यते यद्वा  
 ऋते<sup>१०</sup> प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्येत पूयेव<sup>११</sup> संभवेत् । यान्संधीनं अधिदैवतम-

<sup>१</sup> \*मन्तस्थारूपम् B and the other MSS., besides R and S. <sup>२</sup> न इत् B, cf. on III, 2, 2. <sup>३</sup> B inserts ३(?) after each of the three genitives and nasalizes पर्वणां. <sup>४</sup> चीणि B. <sup>५</sup> सप्त विंशतिश्च B, as reported by Max Müller, but this is wrong. <sup>६</sup> विंशतिश्च A; संवत्स B. <sup>७</sup> \*मानच B. <sup>८</sup> Lost to end in B, except वर्मायुरेति. <sup>९</sup> Numbered 7 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L, 7 in B, D. <sup>१०</sup> चामाह (?) B. <sup>११</sup> सन्धीन्य B. <sup>१२</sup> रिते B. <sup>१३</sup> पूयेन B.

वोचाम पर्वणि तान्यध्यात्मम् । तस्यैतस्य<sup>१</sup> चयस्यास्थां मज्ज्ञां  
पर्वणामिति पञ्चेतश्चत्वारिंशच्छतानि पञ्चेतस्तदशीतिसहस्रं भव-  
त्यशीतिसहस्रं वा अर्केलिंनो बृहतीरहरभिसंपादयन्ति । स एषो  
ऽक्षरसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो<sup>२</sup> वाङ्मय  
आत्मा । स य एवमेतमक्षरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं  
मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाक्षराणां सायुज्यं सरूपतां सलो-  
कतामश्नुते<sup>३</sup> पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥<sup>१०</sup>

चत्वारः पुरुषा इति<sup>१</sup> बाधः<sup>२</sup> शरीरपुरुषश्छन्दःपुरुषो वेद-  
पुरुषो महापुरुष इति । शरीरपुरुष इति यमवोचाम स य  
एवायं<sup>३</sup> दैहिक आत्मा तस्य योऽयमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा स रसः ।  
छन्दःपुरुष इति यमवोचामाक्षरसमास्त्राय एव तस्यैतस्याकारो  
रसः । वेदपुरुष इति यमवोचाम येन वेदान्वेद ऋग्वेदं यजुर्वेदं  
सामवेदं तस्यैतस्य ब्रह्मा रसः । तस्माद्ब्रह्माणं<sup>४</sup> ब्रह्मिष्ठं कुर्वीत  
यो यज्ञस्योत्पन्नं पश्येत् । महापुरुष इति यमवोचाम संवत्सर  
एव प्रध्वंसयन्नन्यानि भूतान्येका भावयन्नन्यानि<sup>५</sup> तस्यैतस्यासा-  
वादित्यो रसः । स यश्चायमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य  
एकमेतदिति विद्यात् । तस्मात्पुरुषं पुरुषं प्रत्यादित्यो भवति ।

<sup>१</sup> B inserts चय सिद्ध ज इत्येतत्प्रोक्तम् which is borrowed from III 2 1 above and reads तस्यैतस्य चयस्यासास्त्रायम् <sup>२</sup> करि B <sup>३</sup> \*रहरहर् II and संपादयन्ति

<sup>४</sup> am B <sup>५</sup> अनुमान F om thing पुत्री पशुमान् <sup>१०</sup> Numbered 8 in A E  
H K L, 1 8 in F G 2 in B D

<sup>१</sup> इति om and la una marked in 1

<sup>२</sup> बाध R in text.

<sup>३</sup> \*हम् II

<sup>४</sup> ब्रह्मण B.

<sup>५</sup> \*नान्यानि B



तदपेतदृषिणोक्तम् । चिवं देवानामुदगादनीकं चक्षुर्मिवस्य  
वरुणस्याग्नेः । आप्रा द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरिक्षं सूर्य आत्मा जग-  
तस्तस्युषश्चेति ॥ एतामनुविधं<sup>१</sup> संहितां संधीयमानां मन्य इति  
ह स्माह वाध्वः । एतं ह्येव बह्वृचा महत्युक्थे मीमांसन्त एत-  
मयावध्वर्यव एतं महाव्रते छन्दोगा एतमस्यामेतं दिव्येतं वाया-  
वेतमाकाश एतमप्स्वेतमोषधीष्वेतं वनस्पतिष्वेतं चन्द्रमस्येतं  
नक्षत्रेष्वेतं सर्वेषु भूतेष्वेतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते । न एष संवत्सरसं-  
मानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा ।  
स य एवमेतं संवत्सरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं  
मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं परस्मै शंसति ॥ ३ ॥<sup>२</sup>

दुग्धदोहा अस्य वेदा भवन्ति न तस्यानूक्ते<sup>३</sup> भागोऽस्ति न  
वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमिति । तदपेतदृषिणोक्तम् । यस्तित्याज  
सचिविदं सखायं न तस्य वाच्यमि भागो अस्ति । यदीं णृणो-  
त्यलकं णृणोति न हि<sup>४</sup> प्र वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थामिति ॥ न  
तस्यानूक्ते भागोऽस्ति न वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमित्येतत्तदुक्तं  
भवति । तस्मादेवं विद्वान् परस्मा श्रमिं<sup>५</sup> चिनुयान् परस्मै  
महाव्रतेन सुवीत न परस्मा एतदहः शंसेत् । कामं पिबे  
वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मन एवास्य तत्कृतं भवति । स यश्चाय-  
मशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य एकमेतदित्यवोचाम । तौ

<sup>१</sup> वितांक B. <sup>२</sup> गधिषु B. <sup>३</sup> नक्षत्रेष्वेतं B. <sup>४</sup> Numbered 9 in  
A, E, H, K, L; 3, 9 in F, G; -3 in B, D.

<sup>५</sup> नक्ष B. <sup>६</sup> हि—यधिम all, save a few letters and the following न परस्मा,  
lost in D.

यत्र विहीयेते चन्द्रमा इवादित्यो<sup>9</sup> दृश्यते न रश्मयः प्रादुर्भवन्ति  
लोहिनी द्यौर्भवति यथा मञ्जिष्ठा व्यस्तः पायुः काककुलायग-  
न्धिकमस्य शिरो वायति संपरेतोऽस्यात्मा न<sup>10</sup> चिरमिव जीवि-  
ष्यतीति<sup>11</sup> विद्यात् । स यत्करणीयं मन्येत तत्कुर्वीत यदन्ति यच्च  
दूरक इति सप्त जपेदादित्प्रत्नस्य रेतस इत्येका यत्र ग्रहा  
पवमानेति षष्ठुद्वयं तमसस्परीत्येका । अथापि यच्च छिद्र इवा-  
दित्यो दृश्यते रचनाभिरिवाभिख्यायेत छिद्रां वा छायां पश्येत्त-  
दप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथाप्यादर्शं वोदके वा जिह्मशिरसं वा-  
शिरसं<sup>12</sup> वात्मानं पश्येद्विपर्यस्ते वा कन्याके जिह्मेन वा दृश्ये-  
यातां तदप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथाप्यपिधायाक्षिणी उपेक्षेत  
तद्यथा वटिरकाणि<sup>13</sup> संपतन्तीव<sup>14</sup> दृश्यन्ते तानि यदा न पश्येत्त-  
दप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथाप्यपिधाय कर्णा उपशृणुयात्स एषो  
अप्तेरिव प्रज्वलतो<sup>15</sup> रश्म्येवोपच्छिस्तं<sup>16</sup> यदा न शृणुयात्तदप्ये-  
वमेव विद्यात् । अथापि यच्च नील इवाग्निर्दृश्यते यथा मयूर-  
यीर्वा<sup>17</sup>मेघे वा विद्युतं<sup>18</sup> पश्येन्मेघे वा विद्युतं न पश्येन्महामेघे  
वा मरीचीरिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात् । अथापि यच्च भूमिं  
ज्वलन्तीमिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात् । इति प्रत्यक्षदर्श-  
नानि । अथ स्वप्नाः<sup>19</sup> । पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं

<sup>9</sup> एवादित्यो B<sup>10</sup> न म F, G<sup>11</sup> जीवषि (य) थति B<sup>12</sup> वाशरीरमात्मान B, वाशिरस om A, D pr man, G, B has कान्यके infra<sup>13</sup> वटिरकाणि B<sup>14</sup> संपतन्तीवा B, संपतन्ती II in text, सपतन्तीव A, D, F<sup>15</sup> I, G, H, k, L S.<sup>16</sup> ज्वलतो B<sup>17</sup> रश्म्य—य om B in text The words

are in all MSS.

<sup>18</sup> मयूरयीव. (or वा) यमेघे B<sup>19</sup> B add k<sup>20</sup> दर्शनादन् and स्वप्नः B, II has in commentary स्वप्नाः उच्यते

हन्ति वराह<sup>14</sup> एनं हन्ति मर्कट एनमास्कन्दयथाशु वायुरेनं  
 प्रवहति सुवर्णं खादित्वापगिरति<sup>15</sup> मध्वघ्नाति विसानि भक्षय-  
 न्येकपुण्डरीकं धारयति खरैर्वराहैर्युक्तैर्याति कृष्णां धेनुं कृष्णवत्सां  
 नलदमाली दक्षिणामुखो प्राजयति । स यद्येतेषां किञ्चित्प्रश्ये-  
 दुपोष पायसं स्थालीपाकं अपयित्वा रात्रीसूक्तेन<sup>16</sup> प्रत्यूचं  
 हुत्वान्येनान्येन धाक्षणाभोजयित्वा चरुं स्वयं प्राप्नीयात् । स  
 योऽंतोऽश्रुतोऽगतोऽमतोऽनतोऽदृष्टोऽविज्ञातोऽनादिष्टः श्रोता  
 मन्ता द्रष्टादेष्टा घोष्टा विज्ञाता प्रज्ञाता सर्वेषां भूतानामन्तर-  
पुरुषः स म आत्मेति विद्यात् ॥४॥<sup>17</sup>

अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषत् । सर्वा स्तेवेमाः सर्वस्यै  
 वाच उपनिषद्<sup>1</sup> इमां त्वेवाचक्षते । पृथिव्या रूपं स्पर्शा अन्त-  
 रिक्षस्योष्माणो दिवः स्वराः । अग्ने रूपं स्पर्शा वायोऽहोष्माण  
 आदित्यस्य स्वराः । ऋग्वेदस्य रूपं स्पर्शा यजुर्वेदस्योष्माणः<sup>2</sup>  
 सामवेदस्य स्वराः । चक्षुषो रूपं स्पर्शाः श्रोत्रस्योष्माणो मनंसः  
 स्वराः । प्राणस्य रूपं स्पर्शा अपानस्योष्माणो व्यानस्य स्वराः ।  
 अथ खल्वियं देवी वीणा भवति तदनुकृतिरसौ मानुषी वीणा  
 भवति । यथास्याः शिर एवमुण्याः शिरो यथास्या उदरमेव<sup>3</sup>

<sup>14</sup> वराह—हन्ति om. F, which omits also दृक्षति—श्वायेत. <sup>15</sup> एनमा-  
 स्कन्दति B. <sup>16</sup> रात्रिसूक्तेन B. <sup>17</sup> स यतश्श्रुतो B.  
<sup>18</sup> om. B. <sup>19</sup> Numbered 10 in A, E, H, K, L; 10, 4 in F; 4, 10 in G;  
 4 in B, D.  
<sup>1</sup> उपनिषद् B. <sup>2</sup> वायोष्ण F, G. <sup>3</sup> अहो B. <sup>4</sup> उदर B.

ममुष्या अम्भणं यथास्यै<sup>8</sup> जिह्वैवममुष्यै वादनं यथास्यास्तन्त्रय  
 एवममुष्या अद्गुलयो यथास्याः स्वरा एवममुष्याः स्वरा यथास्या  
 स्पर्श एवममुष्या स्पर्श यथा ह्येवेयं शब्दवती तर्ध्ववत्येवमसौ  
 शब्दवती तर्ध्ववती यथा ह्येवेयं लोमशेन चर्मणापिहिता भव-  
 त्वेवमसौ लोमशेन<sup>7</sup> चर्मणापिहिता<sup>9</sup> । लोमशेन<sup>9</sup> ह स्म<sup>9</sup> वै  
 चर्मणा पुरा<sup>7</sup> वीणा अपिदधति । स यो हैतां देवीं<sup>10</sup> वीणां वेद  
 श्रुतवदनो भवति भूमिप्रास्य कीर्तिर्भवति यत्र क्व चार्या वाचो  
 भाषन्ते विदुरेनं तत्र । अथातो वायसो यस्यां संसद्यधीयानो  
 वा भाषमाणो वा न विरुचिषेत<sup>11</sup> तच्चेतामृचं जपेत् । ओष्ठा-  
 पिधाना<sup>12</sup> नकुली दन्तैः परिवृता पविः । सर्वस्यै वाच ईशाना  
 चारु मामिह वादयेत् । इति वायसः ॥५॥<sup>13</sup>

अथ हास्मा एतत्कृष्णहारितो चाग्भास्त्रणमिवोपोदाहरति ।  
 प्रजापतिः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा व्यसंस्त<sup>1</sup> संवत्सरः । स छन्दोभिरात्मानं  
 समदधाद्यच्छन्दोभिरात्मानं समदधात्तस्मात्संहिता । तस्यै वा  
 एतस्यै संहितायै एकारे बलं षकारः प्राण आत्मा । स यो  
 हैतौ एकारषकारावनुसंहितमृचो वेद सबलां समाणां संहितां

<sup>8</sup> यथा—लो lost in B

<sup>9</sup> भवति—पिहिता om in K but add pr man.

<sup>7</sup> लोमशेन—पुरा lost in B Here and above R has पिहिता <sup>8</sup> चर्मणा—

लोमशेन om G <sup>9</sup> ह स्म L <sup>10</sup> देवी B <sup>11</sup> विरुचिषेत A F, G, K, L,

B S, विरुचिषेत B O, D, E, H <sup>12</sup> This verse occurs also in the Saṁti verses,

note on I 1 3, and see explanatory notes <sup>13</sup> Numbered 11 in A, E, H, K, L,

B 11 in F, G, 5 in B D

<sup>1</sup> व्यसंस्तदा संवत्सर B; प्रजाः E

वेदायुषमिति विद्यात् । ॥ यदि विचिकित्सेत्सणकारं ब्रवाणी<sup>३</sup> ३<sup>३</sup>  
 अणकारां<sup>३</sup> इति सणकारमेव ब्रूयात्सषकारं ब्रवाणी<sup>३</sup> ३<sup>३</sup> अष-  
 कारां<sup>३</sup> इति सषकारमेव ब्रूयात् । ते यदयमनुसंहितमृचो  
 ऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो णकारषकारा  
 उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः । अथ यदयमनुसंहित-  
 मृचोऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो णकार-  
 षकारा उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह स्थविरः शाकल्यः [ एतच्च स्म  
 वै तद्विद्वांस आहुर्क्षयः कावपेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्मामहे  
 किमर्था वयं यस्यामहे<sup>४</sup> वाचि हि प्राणं जुहुमः<sup>५</sup> प्राणे<sup>६</sup> वा  
 वाचं यो<sup>१०</sup> ह्येव प्रभवः स एवाप्ययः । ता एताः संहिता  
 नानन्तेवासिने प्रब्रूयान्नासंवास्तरवासिने नाप्रवक्तु इत्याचार्या  
 आचार्याः ॥ ६ ॥<sup>११</sup> ]

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>१२</sup>

॥ इति तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

<sup>३</sup> The arrangement of the *plais* is confirmed by the commentary. In ब्रवाणी<sup>३</sup> B omits the nasal <sup>३</sup> Nasal om B <sup>४</sup> माण्डूकेयूय B (perhaps for 'यी')

<sup>५</sup> 'संहिताम् B. <sup>६</sup> उपाप्ना B, against the rule of Sandhi of the Āranyaka <sup>७</sup> वयस्या-  
 महे B <sup>८</sup> जुहुमः B <sup>९</sup> प्राणो—वाच B in text. <sup>१०</sup> चो K <sup>११</sup> Numbered ११

in A, E, H, K, L, 6, 12 in F, G, 6 in B, D <sup>१२</sup> इत्यैतरेयारण्यके तृतीयस्य तृतीयस्य  
 तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥ ३ ॥ इति तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् A, where the error is worthy of note in  
 view of the so-called Adhyāya in B. द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥ २ ॥ तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् F, G;  
 द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥ तृतीयारण्यः ॥ D. इति तृतीयारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । समाप्तम् । K.  
 इति तृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयाध्यायः । इति तृतीयारण्यके समाप्तम् । औ अथातः संहितायाः  
 षट् । प्राणो षष्ठः षट् । अथातः हिताया अथ खल्वियं द्वौ । L, B has रत्नविदे  
 संहितारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः । Then follows the third Adhyāya which is given in

the note on I, 1, 1. B has हरिः श्रीं । विदा मघवन् । अथ हाष्मा एतच्छ्रवहा-  
 रितः । अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्य वाच उपनिषत् । दुग्धदोहा अस्व वेदा भवन्ति । चत्वारः  
 पुरुषा इति ब्राह्मः । अथ कौण्डरव्यः । प्राणो वंश इति खविरः शाकल्यः । बृहद्रथ-  
 नारयो ह्येष । अथ खल्वाङ्गनिर्मुञ्जवक्त्राः । अघातोऽनुव्याहाराः । अघातो निर्मुञ्जप्र-  
 वादाः । अथ शाकल्यस्य । अघातसंहिताया उपनिषत् । अघातसंहिताष्टौ । प्राणो  
 वंश इति षट् । अघातसंहिताया द्वादौ । इति तृतीयारण्यं समाप्तं । हरिः श्रीम् ।  
 B has text with समाप्तः added

॥ अथ चतुर्थारण्यकम् ॥

वि॒दा<sup>१</sup> म॑घचन्वि॒दा गा॑तुमनुं शंसिषो दि॒शः ।  
 शि॒क्षा श॑चीनां पते पूर्वी॒णां पु॑रुवसो ॥१॥  
 आ॒भिष्टु॑म॒भिष्टि॑भिः प्रचे॒तन् प्र चे॑तय ।  
 इन्द्र॑ द्युन्नाय॑ न इ॒म ए॒वा<sup>२</sup> हि श॒क्रः ॥२॥  
 रा॒ये वा॒जाय॑ वज्रि॒वः श॑र्विष्ठ<sup>३</sup> वज्रि॒नृञ्जसे॑ ।  
 म॑हिष्ठ वज्रि॒नृञ्जस॑ आ या॒हि पि॒व म॑त्स्व ॥३॥  
 वि॒दा रा॒यः सु॒वीर्यं॑ भुवो वा॒जानां॑ पति॒र्वशां॑ अ॒नु ।  
 म॑हिष्ठ वज्रि॒नृञ्जसे॑ यः श॑र्विष्ठः पू॒राणाम् ॥४॥  
 यो म॑हिष्ठो<sup>४</sup> म॒घोनां॑ चि॒कित्वो<sup>५</sup> अ॒भि नो॑ तय ।  
 इन्द्रो॑ विदे तमुं सु॒षे व॒शी हि श॒क्रः ॥५॥  
 तमू॒तये॑ हवामहे जेता॒र्मप॑राजितम्<sup>६</sup> ।  
 स नः॑ पर्ष॒दति॒ द्विषः<sup>७</sup> क्रतु॑च्छन्द॒ च्युतं॑ बृ॒हत् ॥६॥

<sup>१</sup> Accents do not appear in A D, F, G K, L, B. But the accents are undoubtedly old and the fact that the other verses cited in the book are not usually accented is not in point, since these are non Rgvedic verses. Similarly in Āranyaka V the non-Rgvedic verses are all accented. The motive is obvious, that the repeaters of the text should have guidance in repeating verses not from their own Samhitā.

<sup>२</sup> आविष् A, in R आ॒भिष्टु॑म. <sup>३</sup> एव L. <sup>४</sup> शर्विष्ठः R, dividing here the verse. <sup>५</sup> चि॒कित्वो F. <sup>६</sup> माहिष्ठो F. माहिष्ठो G. <sup>७</sup> चि॒कित्वा L, चि॒कित्वः R. <sup>८</sup> म॒पराजितम् L. <sup>९</sup> द्विषत् G.

इन्द्रं धनस्य सातये हवामहे जेतामपराजितम् ।

स नः पर्यदति द्विषः स नः पर्यदति सिधः ॥७॥

पूर्वस्य यत्तै अद्रिवः सुष आ धैहि नो वसो ।

पूर्तिः शविष्ठ शस्यत<sup>16</sup> ईशे हि शक्रः ॥८॥

नूनं तं नय्यं संन्यसे प्रभो जनस्य वृत्रहन् ।

समन्येषु ब्रवावहै शूरो यो<sup>17</sup> गोषु गच्छति सखां सुशेवो  
छद्मयाः ॥९॥

एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्रा<sup>18</sup> ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हीन्द्रा<sup>19</sup> ॥ एवा

ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा<sup>20</sup> ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि पूषा<sup>21</sup> ॥ एवा

ह्येवैवा हि देवा<sup>22</sup> ॥१०॥ एवा हि शक्रो वशी हि शक्रो वशी<sup>23</sup>

अनु<sup>24</sup> ॥ आ यो मन्याय मन्यव उपो मन्याय मन्यवे ॥ उपेहि

विश्वध<sup>25</sup> ॥११॥ विदा मघवन्विदो<sup>26</sup> ॥

॥ इत्येतेर्यारण्यके चतुर्थारण्यं समाप्तम् ॥<sup>27</sup>

<sup>16</sup> शस्यत F    <sup>21</sup> यो om. L    <sup>22</sup> After अग्रा F has इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैव द्वी<sup>28</sup>

एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा<sup>29</sup> ॥ G has इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्रा इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैवा  
हि विष्णा<sup>30</sup> ॥ B has हीन्द्रम् and so A, E, K, L, S has ही<sup>31</sup> ॥ D only has  
हीन्द्रा<sup>32</sup> which must clearly be right    <sup>23</sup> वशी A, D, E, F, G, K, पूषा<sup>33</sup> B

<sup>24</sup> देवाः A, D, E, F, G, K, R.    <sup>25</sup> वशी D, E, G H, L B, S    A and E have  
the plus which is more likely to have been wrongly omitted than to have been inserted

<sup>26</sup> विश्वध G.    <sup>27</sup> विदोम् D    <sup>28</sup> इत्येतेर्यारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः । इति  
चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । A: प्रथमोऽध्यायः । इति चतुर्थारण्यः । D, विदा मघवन्विदा ।  
हरिः श्रीम् । इति चतुर्थारण्यं समाप्तम् । E, चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । F, चतुर्थारण्यकं सं  
(पूर्णम् in later hand), G, इति चतुर्थारण्यं प्रथमोऽध्यायः । समाप्तम् । K, इति  
चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । L.



These verses occur also in the Kashmir MS of the Rgvedic Khelas (=K), which (V. 4) contains Āraṇyaka IV, in Sāmaveda, Naigeyasākhā, ed. Ajāmere, 1901, p. 48, in Sāmaveda, Āraṇyaka-saṃhitā, ed. by Fortunatov, p. 74. and in Peterson, *Second Report*, p. 97 (=P). K reads in v. 1 मघन्, which saves the metre, in vv. 3, 4, वच्चिन् before वच्चसे, treating वच् as equivalent to रि, in v. 4 K, P, SV read राये, probably a mere correction for the difficult रायाः, in v. 5 SV. has जुहि ईय, SV. Ā. जुहि ईये, in vv. 6 and 7 SV. has सर्वद् for पर्यद्, in v. 7 द्विपः for त्रिपः, in v. 8 चद्विषोऽमुर्मदाय मुञ्च. In v. 8 K, P have हसन्त, and SV वशी for ईये. In v. 9 K, P have मयसे, an obvious correction, see my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 224, SV. has चयेयुं and चदयुः. The second पुरीषपद is put third in K, the third is omitted in P and SV, and the last six in SV. In the second last K, P read विदध. The variants of the SV. appear all to be in the nature of attempted corrections, and the Astaveya seems to have possessed the oldest form of the words known to us, though it cannot obviously be the original form as Oldenberg points out.

With regard to the accents, in v 2 अहम् is unaccented in K and P as in R. It has वृत्तम्. In v 3 पिब = unaccented in K, which is most probably wrong. In v 5 both K and R have चिकित्सी, P चिकित्वा, while K has चय, and R has क्षुधि. In v 9 K has गच्छति, which cannot well be correct, and चक्षुः, also unaccented. In the पुरीष-पदानि R has एवा, which cannot be accepted, while K has हि unaccented, which is inconsistent. K has also no plus in the case of होन्द्र ! हि धूपम् ! and हि देवाः ! It accents स्पृष्टः ! स्पृष्टः ! of which one or both must be wrong, and it twice has एवेवा. It has आर्यो भूयार्य. The accentuation of the first five पुरीषपदानि is very remarkable, and can only be explained by taking हि as unaccented both when combined and when alone, and by holding that the second एवा in एवेवा is unaccented. In the Ajmere ed of the Mahābhārata the पुरीषपदानि appear as एवा होन्द्रः होन्द्रः एवा होन्द्रः एवा होन्द्रः एवा हि धूपम् एवा हि देवाः । In P they are very corrupt

॥ अथ पञ्चमारण्यकम् ॥ .

ADHYĀYA 1.

महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं सामिधेयः । एकविंशती प्रागुपो-  
त्तमायाः समिधामिमिति चतस्रः । वैश्वकर्मण कृषंभ उपाल-  
म्भनीय उपांशु । आज्यप्रउगे विश्वजितः । होचार्थतुर्विंशत् ।  
ईह्यन्तीरपस्युव इति च ब्राह्मणाच्छस्यावपेत प्रातःसवने तीव्र-  
स्याभिवयसो अस्य पाहीति माध्यन्दिने । चिकटुकेषु महिषो  
यवाशिरमिति स्तोत्रियः । 'एन्द्र यात्युप नः परावत' इन्द्राय हि  
द्यौरसुरो<sup>१</sup> अनम्रत, 'प्रो ध्वस्मै पुरोरथमित्यतोऽनुरूपः । चतुर्विं-  
शन्मरुत्वतीयस्यातानोऽसत्तु मे जरितः साभिवेगः' 'पिवा  
सोममभि यमुय तर्दः' कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा<sup>२</sup> मरुवाँ  
इन्द्र वृषभो रणाय, 'जनिष्ठा उयः सहसे तुरायेति मरुत्वतीयम् ।  
स्थिते मरुत्वतीये होता विसंस्थितसंचरेण निष्कन्याग्नीधीये  
तिस्र आज्याहुतीर्जुहोत्यीदुध्वरेण सुवेण ।

अनु मामिन्द्रो अनु मां बृहस्पतिरनु सोमो अनु वाग्देव्यावीत् ।  
अनु मां मित्रावरुणाविहावन्तामनु द्यावापृथिवी पूर्वहूतौ ॥  
आदित्या मा विश्वे अवन्तु देवाः सप्त राजानो य उताभिषिक्ताः ।  
वायुः पूषा वरुणः सोमो अग्निः सूर्यो नक्षत्रैरवत्विह मा नु ॥

<sup>१</sup> \* वाग्—असुरो om. L. pr. MAN.  
for the 'उद्' of MSS. and edd.

<sup>२</sup> अमू देवाम् A

<sup>३</sup> So I read

पितरो मा विश्वमिदं च भूतं पृथिमातरो मस्तः स्वकाः ।

ये अग्निजिह्वा उत वा यजचास्ते नो देवाः सुहवाः शर्म यच्छतेति ॥

दक्षिणे मार्जालीये दश सुच्युत्तमां चतुर्गृहीतं पूर्वमवदायो-  
त्तरतोऽग्रेरुपनिधाय विहरणप्रभृति मध्यन्दिने मार्जालीयो  
जागरितो भवति तस्मिन्परिवृते जुहोति प्राग्द्वारे चोदग्द्वारे वा  
प्रागुदग्द्वारे वा अग्निरिवानाधृष्यः पृथिवीव सुषदा भूयासम् ।  
अन्तरिक्षमिवानाधृष्यो भूयासम् । सूर्य इवाप्रति-  
धृष्यश्चन्द्रमा इव पुनर्भूर्भूयासम् । मन इवापूर्वं वायुरिव श्लोकभू-  
र्भूयासम् । अहरिव स्वं रात्रिरिव प्रियो भूयासम् । गाव इव  
पुनर्भुवो मिथुनमिव मरीचयो भूयासम् । आप इव रस  
ओषधय इव रूपं भूयासम् । अन्नमिव विभु यज्ञ इव प्रभुर्भू-  
यासम् । ब्रह्मेव लोके क्षत्रमिव श्रियां भूयासम् । यद्य एषा  
समितिर्भवातीति । अथ विभजाय वीचेति वीरयनन्युचम् ।  
अथ तिष्ठन्नादित्यमुपतिष्ठते पर्यावृत्ते प्रदक्षिणमावृत्त्येतैश्चैवा-  
स्वाहाकारैरेतेवा३ इदं मधू३ इदं मधु इमं तीव्रसुतं पिवा३  
इदं मधू३ इदं मध्विति च । प्रेष्याः संशास्ति पूर्णकुम्भास्त्रिस्तो  
ऽवमाः षष्ठुत्तमाः । इमं धिषण्यमुदकुम्भं च त्रिः प्रदक्षिणं  
परिव्रजाय दक्षिणेः पाणिभिर्दक्षिणानूरूनांमाना एतेवा३ इदं  
मधू३ इदं सध्विति वदत्यः ॥२॥<sup>१</sup>

<sup>१</sup> om B in text; it is in A, D, B, F, G, K, L, R in commentary, S add A <sup>२</sup> मधू३ om F (at end of a leaf). <sup>३</sup> ननु G. <sup>४</sup> The accents are

taken from E and R. R has चनु मा before बृहस्पतिः and चनु चागः also उत वा यजचास् and मा नु. If मानु is read, with Śrīyana, the accent must be altered. In देवाः सुहवाः there is probably a vocative, if not, the accent must be changed.

उपाकृते स्तोत्रे वैधं निनयाथाचोत्तरे च मार्जालीये शेषम-  
न्तर्वेदीति । प्रदक्षिणमग्निं निष्क्रम्यायेण यूपं पुरस्तात्प्रत्यङ्मुख-  
स्तिष्ठन्नग्नेः शिर उपतिष्ठते नमस्ते गायत्राय<sup>१</sup> यत्ते शिर इति ।  
तेनैव यथेतं प्रत्येत्य दक्षिणमुदङ्मुखः पक्षं नमस्ते राधन्तराय  
यस्ते दक्षिणः पक्ष इति । अपरेणाग्निपुच्छमतिक्रम्य प्राङ्मुख  
उत्तरं नमस्ते बृहते यस्त उत्तरः पक्ष इति । पश्चात्प्राङ्मुखं  
नमस्ते भद्राय यत्ते पुच्छ या ते प्रतिष्ठेति<sup>२</sup> । दक्षिणतः पुच्छस्या-  
त्मानं<sup>३</sup> नमस्ते राजनाय यस्त आत्मेति ॥२॥

[यथेतं सदः प्रसर्पति । पुरस्तात्प्रेह उपकृप्तो भवति । स्थूणे  
रज्जू वीवध इत्येतत्प्रक्षाल्य तीर्थेन प्रपाद्योत्तरेणाग्नीध्रीयं परि-  
व्रज्य पूर्व्या द्वारा सदः सर्वाग्निष्ण्यानुत्तरेण । औदुम्बराणि  
काष्ठानि प्रेहस्य भवन्ति पालाशानि मिश्राणि वा । चीणि  
फलकान्युभयतस्तण्डानि वे वा सूच्यथ तावत्यः] इष्टुमाचं  
प्राङ्मेहो निमुष्टिकस्तिर्यङ्मुदगंयः<sup>४</sup> प्रागयाभ्यां सूचीभ्यां समुतः ।  
दक्षिणोत्तरे स्थूणे निखामाभितो होतृषदनं<sup>५</sup> वीवधमत्यादधात्या-  
स्यसमितं कर्तुः । कुशासु छिद्राणि प्रेहस्य भवन्ति रज्जुभ्यामू-  
र्ध्वमुद्वयति दक्षिणतो<sup>६</sup> दक्षिणयोत्तरतः सव्यया दार्भ्ये त्रिगुणे  
स्यातां सव्यदक्षिणे पञ्चव्यायामे द्विगुणे वीवधे चिः प्रदक्षिणं  
पर्यस्योर्ध्वमग्निं निष्टक्यं बभ्राति । शाखाभिर्बृसीभिर्वा पर्यृषन्त्य-

<sup>१</sup> गाय A. <sup>२</sup> पुच्छ A. <sup>३</sup> D omits the number and so reckons the following Khandas as nos 2 5 instead of 3-6

<sup>४</sup> भद्रग A. <sup>५</sup> यय A. <sup>६</sup> षदन R in text <sup>७</sup> om R in text.

प्रकम्पि । चतुरङ्गुलेनैष<sup>१</sup> विभूमः प्रेङ्गः स्यान्मुष्टिमात्रेण वा ।  
दक्षिणत उदाहिततरः समो वा । पद्मात्रे धिष्यात् ॥३॥<sup>२</sup>

निष्ठिते प्रेङ्गे होता वाणमौदुम्बरं शततन्तुमुभाभ्यां परिगृ-  
ह्योत्तरत उपोहते यथा वीणाम् । सप्तभिर्छन्दोभिश्चतुस्तैः  
स्थानान्यस्योर्ध्वमुद्गृह्णीयाद्दशभिर्वा । गायत्रेण त्वा छन्दसोद्ग्रा-  
म्यौष्णिहेन त्वानुष्टुभेन त्वा वार्हतेन त्वा पाङ्केन त्वा वैष्टुभेन त्वा  
जागतेन त्वा विराजेन त्वा वैपदेन त्वातिछन्दसा त्वेति । छन्दा-  
स्यनुक्रम्य स्थानानामनुपरिक्रमणमौदुम्बर्याद्र्या शाखया सप्तला-  
शया मूलदेशेन वाणं चिरूर्ध्वमुत्तिष्ठति । प्राणाय त्वापानाय  
त्वा ध्यानाय त्वोत्तिष्ठामीति । अन्येभ्योऽपि कामेभ्यः पुनरपि  
न तूत्तिष्ठामीति ब्रूयात् । अथैनं सशाखं छन्दोगेभ्यः प्रयच्छति ।  
भूतेभ्यस्त्वेति पञ्चाद्वै फलके पाणी प्रतिष्ठापयति प्राणमनुप्रे-  
ङ्गस्त्वेति प्राञ्चं प्रेङ्गं प्रणयेति ध्यानमनुवीहस्त्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपा-  
नमन्वीहस्त्वेत्यभ्यात्मम् । भूर्भुवः स्वरिति जपति । प्राणाय त्वेति  
प्राञ्चमेव ध्यानाय त्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपानाय त्वेत्यभ्यात्मम् । वस-  
वस्त्वा गायत्रेण छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति पञ्चाद्वै फलके  
ऽरुनी प्रतिष्ठापयति । अथ पूर्वं फलकं नाना पाणिभ्यामभिपद्येत  
यथाहिः<sup>३</sup> सप्तस्यन् । मध्यमं छुबुकेनोपस्पृशेद्द्वयोर्वा संधिम्<sup>४</sup> ।  
रुद्रास्त्वा वैष्टुभेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति दक्षिणं<sup>५</sup>  
सकथ्यतिहरति । आदित्यास्त्वा जागतेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वा-

<sup>१</sup> दृष्टेन A.<sup>२</sup> Numbered 3 in D<sup>३</sup> न्योः S <sup>४</sup> यथाहि A, D, E, K, L. यथा हि B; थाहि P, G. <sup>५</sup> संधि A.<sup>६</sup> दक्षिणं—इति cum A

रोहामीति' सव्यम् । विश्वे त्वा देवा आनुष्टुभेन<sup>१</sup> छन्दसारोहन्तु  
तानन्वारोहामीति समारोहति पश्चात्स्वस्य धिष्ण्यस्य दक्षिणं  
पादं प्राञ्चं प्रतिष्ठापयन्त्यथ सव्यं यदेतरः<sup>२</sup> आम्बेदयेतरं यदेतरो  
ऽयेतरं । नोभौ विभूमौ कुर्यात् । कूर्चान्होत्रकाः समारोहन्ति  
ब्रह्मा चौदुस्ररीमासन्दीमुद्गाता । यदि कस्मैचिदवश्यकर्मणे'  
जिगमिषेदादिश्य पालं प्राङ्बुरुह्य' चरित्वा तमर्धमेवमेवाज-  
पयावृतारोहेत् ॥४॥'

प्रस्तोतारं संशस्ति पञ्चविंशस्य स्तोमस्य तिसृष्वर्धतृतीया-  
स्वर्धत्रयोदशासु वा परिशिष्टासु प्रथमं प्रतिहारं प्रवृत्तादिति ।  
अर्धत्रयोदशासु प्रवाचयतेति<sup>३</sup> जातूकर्ण्यः । प्रोक्ते जपति ।  
सुपर्णोऽसि गरुत्मान्प्रेमां वाचं वदिष्यामि बहु वदिष्यन्तीं बहु  
'पतिष्यन्तीं' बहु करिष्यन्तीं बहु सनिष्यन्तीं बहोर्भूयः करिष्यन्तीं  
स्वर्गंछन्तीं स्वर्वदिष्यन्तीं स्वः पतिष्यन्तीं स्वः करिष्यन्तीं स्वः  
सनिष्यन्तीं स्वरिमं यज्ञं वक्ष्यन्तीं स्वर्मा यजमानं वक्ष्यन्ती-  
मिति । दीक्षिते यजमानशब्दो नादीक्षिते । स्वरमुर्मिति यो  
ऽस्य प्रियः स्यान्न तु वक्ष्यन्तीमिति ब्रूयात् । उक्थयवीर्याणि  
च । सं प्राणो वाचा समहं वाचा सं चक्षुर्मनसा समहं मनसा  
सं श्रोत्रमात्मना समहमात्मना मयि महान्मयि भर्गो मयि  
भगो मयि भुजो मयि स्तोभो मयि स्तोमो मयि<sup>४</sup> द्योको मयि

<sup>१</sup> अनुष्टुभेन G    <sup>२</sup> यदेतर K, L, यदेत F, G, यदेतर R in text    <sup>३</sup> कर्मिणे  
D sec. man, F, G, K, L, श्रो ॥    <sup>४</sup> प्राङ्बुरुह्य F, G    <sup>५</sup> Numbered 3 in D  
<sup>६</sup> वाचयति F.    <sup>७</sup> स्वर्गंछन्ती om A    <sup>८</sup> स्वर्वदिष्यन्ती om. D, E, S<sup>1-3</sup>.  
<sup>९</sup> स्वर G    <sup>१०</sup> मयि श्लोको om F

घोषो मयि यशो मयि श्रीर्मयि कीर्तिर्मयि भुक्तिरिति । आहूय  
वागिति जपति । त्रय आहावाः शस्त्रादेर्निविदः परिधानीयाया  
इति । शब्दानन्वयवः कारयन्ति<sup>१</sup> । एतस्मिन्नहनि प्रभूतमन्नं  
दद्यात् । राजपुत्रेण चर्म व्याधयन्त्याग्नन्ति भूमिदुन्दुभिं पत्न्यश्च  
काण्डवीणा भूतानां च मैथुनं ब्रह्मचारिपुंश्चल्योः संप्रवादो  
ऽनेकेन साक्षा निष्क्रेवल्याय स्तुवते राजनस्तीक्ष्णयेण प्रति-  
पद्यते ॥५॥<sup>१</sup>

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं तां सु ते कीर्तिं मघवन्महत्वा भूय  
इष्टावृधे वीर्याय । नृणामु त्वा नृतमं गीर्भिरुक्थैरिति तिस्रः ।  
अथ हैके स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना सृजा समदः सु मधुः  
मधुनाभि योधीरित्यात्मन<sup>२</sup> एते पदे उद्धृत्य पक्षपदे<sup>३</sup> प्रत्यवद-  
धात्यश्वायन्तो मघवन्निन्द्र वाजिनो गामश्च रथ्यमिन्द्र सं किरे-  
त्येतयोश्च स्थान इतरे । श्रियमह गोरश्चमात्मन्धत्ते सं पक्षयोः<sup>४</sup>  
पतनाय । नदं व ओदतीनामित्येतयेतानि व्यतिपजति पादेः  
पादान्बृहतीकारं नदंवन्युत्तराणि प्रथमायां च पुरुषाक्षराण्युप-  
दधाति पादेष्वेकैकमवसाने नृतीयवर्जं स खलु विहरति । अपि  
निदर्शनायोदाहरिष्यामः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं पु । नदं  
व ओदतीनाम्<sup>५</sup> । यतो जज्ञ उयस्त्वेधनृम्णो रु । नदं यो-  
युवतीनोऽम्<sup>६</sup> ॥ सद्यो जज्ञानो नि रिणाति शत्रून् । पतिं वो

<sup>१</sup> करयन्ति F.<sup>२</sup> Numbered 4 in D.<sup>३</sup> सुमधुना only. A.<sup>४</sup> पक्षयोः F, G.<sup>५</sup> पक्ष om. A.<sup>६</sup> रथ्यम् K.R in text <sup>७</sup> संपचियोः F. <sup>८</sup> ओदतीनाम् A, E, K, L, R, S; <sup>९</sup> नाऽम् D, F, G.<sup>१०</sup> युवतीनोम् K; युवतीनाम् E, L; युवतीनाऽम् F, D pr. man. corrected sec. man  
to युवतीनोऽम्; text, A, G, R, S (युवतीनो in text).

अध्यानाम्<sup>1</sup> । अनु<sup>2</sup> यं विश्वे मदन्त्युमाः यो । धेनूनामिषुध्य-  
सोऽमिति ॥ एवमेतां त्रिः । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु राजनेन  
साम्ना स्तुवीरन्यथास्थानं ता इहैवेमाः । असमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तु-  
वीरन्समाम्नातस्य<sup>3</sup> तावतीरुद्धृत्य तत्र ताः शंसेदिहो एवेमाः ।  
अन्यासु चेत्प्राक्सूददोहसस्ताः । तदिदासेत्येतदादि शस्त्रम् ।  
अविहृतश्चात्र प्रतिगरः । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदादिः  
सूददोहाः सूददोहाः ॥ ६ ॥<sup>13</sup>

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>14</sup>

## ADHYAIA 2

यीवाः । यस्येदमारजस्तुजो युजो वनं सहः । इन्द्रस्य रन्त्यं  
बृहत् ॥ नाधृष आ दधर्ष दाधृषाण<sup>1</sup> धृषितं शर्वः । पुरा यदीमति  
व्यधिरिन्द्रस्य धृषितं सहः ॥ स नो ददातु तं रुयिं रुयिं<sup>2</sup> पिश-  
ङ्गसंदृशम् । इन्द्रः पतिस्त्वत्समो जनेष्वा ॥ सूददोहाः । शिरो  
गायत्रिमिन्द्रमिज्ञाधिनो बृहदिति । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु  
स्तुवीरन्नुभया<sup>3</sup> संस्थानविपर्ययोऽसमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तुवीरन्मि-  
थ्यासु च । सूक्तस्योक्तमा सूददोहाः । विज्रवः । सुतस्ते सोम-

<sup>1</sup> अध्यानाम् A अध्रियानाम् F अध्याऽनाम् D (3 add see man) अध्यानाम्  
K L M S एनाऽम् F G <sup>2</sup> अनु A <sup>10</sup> मियुध्यसोम् D F G K L S  
<sup>11</sup> समाम्नातवतीर F <sup>12</sup> शंसेह A <sup>13</sup> Numbered 5 in D <sup>14</sup> Text  
A B इति प्रथमोऽध्याय D पचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्याय F G इति पचम आरण्ये  
प्रथमोऽध्याय K इति पचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्याय L no euphony E R accents  
quite irregularly the words of the first two sentences Cf V 2 2

<sup>1</sup> दाधृषाणा G दार्धषाण L <sup>2</sup> om F G <sup>3</sup> See explanatory notes



उप याहि यज्ञं मन्स्वा मदं पुरु वारं मधाय । मंहिष्ठ इन्द्र  
विजरो<sup>१</sup> गृण्यै ॥ स साहर्तुर्वृत्रहृत्येषु शत्रून्भुविगाह एषः ।  
स नो<sup>२</sup> नेतारं महयाम् इन्द्रम् ॥ इनो वसुः<sup>३</sup> समञः पर्वतेष्टाः  
प्रति वामृजीषी । इन्द्रः शश्वद्भिर्जोहूच एवैः ॥ सूददोहाः । इत्ये-  
तत्तयं यीवाः शिरो विजवः सर्वमर्धर्च्यम्<sup>४</sup> ॥१॥

राघन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अभि त्वा पूर नोनुमोऽभि त्वा  
पूर्वपीतय इति राघन्तरस्य स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ चतस्रः  
सतीः षडुहतीः करोति । इन्द्रस्य नु वीर्याणि प्रवोचं त्वे ह  
यत्पितरश्चिन्न इन्द्रेति पञ्चदश यस्तिग्मशृङ्गो वृषभो न भीम  
उयो जज्ञे वीर्याय स्वधावानुदु घृणाण्यैरत श्रवस्याते मह  
इन्द्रोऽत्युपेति पञ्च सूक्तानि । आ न इन्द्रो दूरादा न आसादिति  
संपातः । इत्या हि सोम इन्मद इति पङ्क्तिः । सूददोहाः । बार्हत  
उत्तरः । त्वामिच्छि हवामहे त्वं ह्येहि चेरव इति बृहतः स्तोत्रि-  
यानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ । चतस्रः<sup>१</sup> सतीः षडुहतीः करोति । तमु  
ष्टुहि यो अभिभूत्योजाः सुत इत्वं निमिष्य इन्द्र सोम इति  
चीरणभूरेको रयिपते रयीणामित्यष्टौ सूक्तानि । कथा महामवृ-  
धत्कस्य होतुरिति संपातः । इन्द्रो मदाय वावृध इति पङ्क्तिः ।

<sup>१</sup> नोतार A <sup>२</sup> वसु R in text and commentary, but the commentary clearly had  
वसुः. <sup>३</sup> मर्धर्च्य F, || <sup>४</sup> Numbered 7 in A, E, K, L, 1, 7 in F, G,

1 in D In R, besides several omitted accents, there occur वृहत्, धृषितं, ददातु,  
सुतस्, मंहिष्ठ, साहर्तुर्वृत्रहृत्येषु शत्रून्, एषः, पर्वतेष्टाः, वीषी. यीवाः has the plus,  
as in V, 3, 1

<sup>१</sup> चतस्रः F.

सूददोहाः । राथन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः पञ्चदशस्तोम<sup>१</sup> एकशतं  
वसिष्ठप्रासाहो बार्हत उत्तरः सप्तदशस्तोमो<sup>२</sup> द्विशतं भरद्वाज-  
प्रासाहः । भद्रं पुष्टं द्विपदासु । इमा नु कं भुवना सीपधामा  
याहि वनसा सहेति नव समाम्नाताः । अयासमाम्नाताः ।

प्र व इन्द्राय युवहन्तामाय विप्रा गाथं गायत यज्जुजोषत् ॥ १ ॥

अर्चन्त्यर्कं देवताः स्वर्का आस्तोभति श्रुतो<sup>३</sup> युवा स इन्द्रः ॥ २ ॥

उप प्रक्षे<sup>४</sup> मधुमति<sup>५</sup> क्षियन्तः<sup>६</sup> पुष्यन्तो रयिं धीमहे तमिन्द्र ॥ ३ ॥

विश्वतो दावन्विश्वतो न<sup>७</sup> आ भर यं त्वा शर्विष्ठमीमहे ॥ ४ ॥

स सुप्रणीति नृतमः स्वराळसि मंहिष्ठो बार्जसातये ॥ ५ ॥

त्वं ह्येक ईशिषे सनादमृक्त ओजसा ॥ ६ ॥

विश्वस्य प्र स्तोभ विद्वान्पुरा वा यदि वेहासं नूनम् ॥ ७ ॥

इयं नो मिवावरुणा कर्तनेळां पीवरीमियं कृणुही न इन्द्र ॥ ८ ॥

शं पदं मयं रयिषणि<sup>८</sup> न सोमो अव्रतं हिनोति न स्पृशेद्रयिः ॥ ९ ॥

• एष ब्रह्मेति तिस्रः आ धूर्ष्वस्मा इत्येका । सूददोहाः । यदा-  
वानेति धाय्या । सूददोहाः ॥ २ ॥<sup>११</sup>

गायत्री तृचाशीतिः । महौ इन्द्रो य ओजसेति तिस्र उक्तमा  
उद्धरति । पुरोळारं नो अन्धस इति तिस्रः । इन्द्र इत्तोमपा

<sup>१</sup> दशः in both cases S, \*स्तोमो ॥ <sup>२</sup> See explanatory notes <sup>३</sup> श्रुते G,  
see explanatory notes <sup>४</sup> उपप्रवे E, see explanatory notes <sup>५</sup> मति A

<sup>६</sup> क्षियन्तः G <sup>७</sup> न om G <sup>८</sup> रयिषां F, G <sup>९</sup> रयिषणि F, G, R in  
commentary <sup>११</sup> Numbered 8 in A B K, L, 2, 8 in F, G, 2 in D. R has

the following incorrect accents besides accenting प्रयायी—प्रयोष, मायत, तास्वर्का,  
स्तीमति श्रुतो, कृणुर्द्विः, विश्वस्य.

एक इत्येतत्प्रभृतीनां तिस्र उक्तमा उद्धरति । तासां स्वादवः  
सोमा आ याहीत्येतामुद्धृत्य न ह्यन्यं वळाकरमित्येतां प्रत्यवद-  
धाति । जज्ञानो नु शतक्रतुरित्येका । पुरुहूतं पुरुष्टुतमिति शेषः ।  
उद्धेदभि श्रुतामघमित्युक्तमामुद्धरति । प्र कृतान्यृजीषिण आ घा  
ये अग्निमित्यत आ नू न इन्द्र क्षुमन्तमिति सूक्ते । सूद-  
दोहाः ॥३॥<sup>१</sup>

वाहती नृचाशीतिः । मा चिदन्यद्वि शंसतेत्येकया न विंशत् ।  
पिवा सुतस्य रसिन इति विंशतेः<sup>२</sup> सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति ।  
यदिन्द्र प्रागघागुदगिति चतुर्दश । वयं घ त्वा सुतावन्त इति  
पञ्चदश<sup>३</sup> । सो घु त्वा वाघतश्चनेत्येतस्य द्विपदां चोद्धरति<sup>४</sup>  
राथन्तरं च प्रगाथम् । अथ हास्य न किः सुदासो रथमित्येतं  
प्रगाथमुद्धृत्य त्वामिदा ह्यो नर इत्येतं प्रगाथं प्रत्यवदधाति ।  
अभि प्र वः सुराधसमिति षड्वालखिल्यानां सूक्तानि । यः  
सचाहा विचर्पणिरिति शेषः । अयं ते अस्तु हर्यत<sup>५</sup> इति सूक्ते ।  
उभयं षृणवच्च न इति सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति । तरोभिर्वा  
विदद्वसुमित्युक्तमामुद्धरति । यो राजा चर्पणोनामित्येकादश । तं  
वो दस्ममृतीपहमा नो विश्वासु हव्यो या इन्द्र भुज क्षाभर इति  
नव । सूददोहाः ॥४॥<sup>६</sup>

<sup>१</sup> Numbered 9 in A, E, K, L; 2, 9 in F; 3, 9 in G; 3 in D.

<sup>२</sup> विंशसते इत् R in text; विंशसतेकया L. In a note to the commentary R gives एकोनविंशत as a variant.

<sup>३</sup> विंशते L.

<sup>४</sup> यदिन्द्र—उद्धरति lit O.

<sup>५</sup> पंचद A.

<sup>६</sup> अस्तुर्यत F.

<sup>७</sup> Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L; 4, 10 in F, G;  
4 in D.

औष्णिहो नृचाशीतिः । य इन्द्र सोमपातम इति सूक्ते । तम्बभि प्र गायतेत्युत्तमामुद्धरति<sup>1</sup> । इन्द्राय साम गायत सखाय आ शिषामहीति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । य एक इद्विदयत आ याह्यद्रिभिः सुतं यस्य त्यच्छ्वरं मद<sup>2</sup> इति त्रयस्तृचा गायत्र्यः संपदोष्णिहः सप्त सप्त गायत्र्यः षट्कुष्णिहो भवन्ति । यदिन्द्राहं यथा त्वं प्र सम्राजं चर्षणीनामिति सूक्ते । उत्तरस्योत्तमे उद्धरति । वार्षहत्याय शवस इत्युत्तमामुद्धरति । सुरुपकृन्तुमूतय इति चीणि । एन्द्रसानसिं रयिमिति सूक्ते । य ज्ञानयात्परावत इति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । रेवतीर्नः सधमाद इति तिस्रः । सूददोहाः । इत्येतास्त्रिस्रस्तृचाशीतयः 'सर्वा अर्धर्च्याः' । अन्नमशीतयः । उदरं वशः । त्वावतः पुरुवसविति वशः । सनितः सुसनितरित्येतदन्तः । ददो रेक्ण इति द्विपदा । नूनम-  
थेत्येकपदा । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदन्तः सूददोहाः सूद-  
दोहाः ॥ ५ ॥<sup>5</sup>

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> मुद्धरति F.    <sup>2</sup> मह K    <sup>3</sup> R joins इति with सूददोहा, against the commentary and the sense    <sup>4</sup> अर्धर्च्या G, अर्धर्चाः D pr man, corrected to

अर्ध्याः    <sup>5</sup> Numbered 11 in A, F, K, L, 5, 11 in F, G, 5 in D    <sup>6</sup> इत्यैतरे-  
यपञ्चमारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः A, इत्यैतरेयारण्यके पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः B,  
पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G, इति पञ्चम आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K, इति  
पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय D, no colophon E

## ADHYAYA 3.

ऊरु<sup>१</sup> । इन्द्राग्नी युवं सु न इत्येतस्यार्धर्चाङ्गायत्रीकारमुत्तर-  
 रमुत्तरस्यानुष्टुप्कारं प्रागुत्तमायाः । प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्यस  
 इति निविद्यानम् । वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो जात एव  
 प्रथमो मनस्वानिति ते अन्तरेणा याह्यर्वाङ्गुप वन्धुरेष्टा विधुं  
 दद्राणं समने बहूनामित्येतदावपनम् । दशतीनामैन्द्रीणां चि-  
 पुञ्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां यावतीरावपेरस्तावन्त्यूर्ध्वमायुषी  
 वर्षाणि जिजीविषेत्संवत्सरात्संवत्सराद्दशतो न वा । त्वमू षु  
 वाजिनं देवजूतम् । इन्द्रो विश्वं वि राजतीत्येकपदा । इन्द्रं  
 विश्वा अवीवृधन्वित्यानुष्टुभम् । तस्य प्रथमायाः पूर्वमर्धर्चं  
 शस्त्वोत्तरेणार्धर्चनोत्तरस्याः पूर्वमर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति पादैः पादा-  
 ननुष्टुप्कारम् । प्रागुत्तमायाः पूर्वस्मात्पूर्वस्मादर्धर्चादुत्तरमुत्तर-  
 मर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति । प्रकृत्या शेषः । पिबा सोममिन्द्र मन्दतु  
 त्वेति षट् । योनिष्ट इन्द्र सद्ने श्चकारीत्येतस्य चतस्रः शस्त्वोत्तमा-  
 सुपसंतत्योपोत्तमया<sup>४</sup> परिदधाति । परिहित उक्थ<sup>५</sup> उक्थसंपदं  
 जपति । उक्थवीर्यस्य स्थान उक्थदोहः ॥ १ ॥<sup>६</sup>

<sup>१</sup> ऊरु<sup>२</sup> B in text and in commentary. But Sāyaṇi does not note the *plati*, and probably it is incorrect. Neither B nor the MSS. have it. Cf. on V, 2, 1. <sup>३</sup> जिजी-  
 विषत् G.

<sup>४</sup> पादानुष्टुप् D pr. man., F, G; पादानानुष्टुप् D sec. man.

<sup>५</sup> पोत्तमाया T, G.

<sup>६</sup> am. F, G.

<sup>७</sup> Numbered 12 in A, E, K, L; 1, 12 in

F, G; 1 in D.

मूर्धा लोकानामसि वाचो रस्स्तेजः प्राणस्यायतनं मनसः ।  
 संवेशश्चक्षुषः संभवः श्रोत्रस्य प्रतिष्ठा हृदयस्य सर्वम् ॥१॥<sup>१</sup>  
 इन्द्रः कर्मोक्षितममृतं व्योम चतुतं सत्यं विजिग्यानं विवाचनम् ।  
 अन्तो वाचो विभुः सर्वस्मादुत्तरं ज्योतिरूधरप्रतिवादः पूर्वम् ॥२॥  
 सर्वं वाक्परागवाक्सप्तं सलिलं धेनु पिबति चक्षुः श्रोत्रं प्राणः ।  
 सत्यसमितं वाक्प्रभूतं मनसो विभूतं हृदयोयं ब्राह्मणभर्तृ-  
 कम् ॥३॥

अन्नशुभे वर्षपवित्रं गोभगं पृथिव्युपरं वरुणवाय्वितमम् ।  
 तपस्त्विन्द्रज्येष्ठं सहसंधारममुताक्षरममृतं दुर्हानम् ॥४॥  
 एतास्त उक्थ भूतय एता वाचो विभूतयः ।  
 तानिर्म इह धुस्वामृतस्य श्रियं महीम् ॥५॥  
 प्रजापतिरिदं ब्रह्म वेदानां ससृजे रसम् ।  
 तेनाहं विश्वमाप्यासं सर्वान्कामान्दुहां मूहत् ॥६॥

भूर्भुवः स्वस्त्रयो वेदोऽसि । ब्रह्म प्रजां मे धुस्व । आयुः  
 प्राणं मे धुस्व । पशून्विशं मे धुस्व । श्रियं यशो मे धुस्व ।  
 लोकं ब्रह्मवर्चसमभयं यज्ञसमृद्धिं मे धुस्व । इति वाचयत्यध-  
 र्युमबुद्धं<sup>२</sup> चेदस्य भवति । ओमुक्थशा यज सोमस्येतीज्यायै संप्रे-  
 षितो ये<sup>३</sup> यजामह इत्यागूर्य नित्ययैव यजति व्यवान्येवानु-

<sup>१</sup> The verses are divided as prose in the MSS, H and S, see explanatory notes

<sup>२</sup> 'मर्तुम्' S <sup>३</sup> 'वध्व' A, H, S, in consequence, no doubt of the following: 'वाय्वि' being written = 'वध्वि' <sup>४</sup> विश्वमाप्यास A <sup>५</sup> 'ममुद्' A, 'ममुद् (?)' I

<sup>६</sup> ३ on S, but the uno in the phrase is constant, and = laid down in Aitareya Srauta Sutra, I, 5 5

वषट्परोति । उक्तं वषट्कारानुमन्त्रणम् । आहरत्यध्वर्युस्त्वथपा-  
चमतिपाद्यांश्चमसांश्च<sup>7</sup> । भक्षं प्रतिख्याय होता प्राङ्मेक्षादव-  
रोहति । अथैतं प्रेक्षं प्रत्यञ्चमववध्नन्ति यथा शंसितारं भक्षयि-  
ष्यन्तं नोपहनिष्यसीति । प्रेक्षस्य ह्यायतनं<sup>8</sup> आसीनो होता  
भक्षयति । अथैतदुक्थपाचं होतोपसृष्टेन जपेन भक्षयति ।  
वाग्देवी सोमस्य नृप्यतु । सोमो मे राजायुः प्राणाय वर्षतु ।  
स मे प्राणः सर्वमायुर्दुहां महदिति । उन्नमादाभिन्नविकानृती-  
यसवनमन्यद्वैश्वदेवान्निविद्यानादस्य वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति  
सलिलस्य दीर्घतमस एकचत्वारिंशतमानोभद्रीयं<sup>9</sup> च तस्य स्थान  
ऐकाहिकी वैश्वदेवस्य प्रतिपदनुचरौ । अथैत चेद्यज्ञायज्ञीयमग्ने  
तव श्रवो वय इति षट्पठोचियानुरूपौ यदीळान्दं भूयसीषु  
चेत्स्तुवीरन्नाग्निं न स्ववृक्तिभिरिति तावतीरनुरूपः । संपन्नं  
महाव्रतं संतिष्ठत इदमहरग्निष्टोमो यथाकालमवभृथं प्रेक्षं हरेयुः  
संदहेयुर्वृसीः ॥२॥<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> चमसं F.<sup>8</sup> अथमासीनो S.<sup>9</sup> आनोभद्रीयं O<sup>10</sup> Numbered 13 in A, E, K, L, 2, 13 in F, G; 2 in D

E omits accents, and it has the accents in many cases obviously wrong. In the case of the double accent of compounds, some of these may be correct; similar instances—some clearly wrong—occur, however, in the Kashmir MS of the Khilas of the Ṛgveda, as Schoffeleowitz (p. 39) points out. The chief cases are, v. 1, वाचो, हृदयस्य सर्वं; v. 2, इन्द्रः कुमार्चितममृतं, वाचो; v. 3, सर्वं, पिबति, वाक्प्रभृतं, हृदयोचं, प्राङ्मेषभृतं; v. 4, वर्षपवित्रं, पृथिव्युषरं, तपस्विन्द्रज्वेष्टं, मयुताचरमः; v. 6, वेदानां सखं, तेनाहं विद्वाम्पासां सर्वान्कामान्दुहां; v. 7, स्वस् and ब्रह्मवर्चसं. पिशं मे and यशो मे are conceivable but improbable.

नादीक्षितो महाव्रतं शंसेन्नानमौ न परस्मै नासंवत्सरं  
 इत्येके कामं पित्रे वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मनो हैवास्य तच्छस्त्रं  
 भवति । होतृशस्त्रेषूक्यशा<sup>१</sup> यजं सोमस्येत्येकः प्रियः संताराशं-  
 सेष्वनाराशंसेषु वा होवकाणाम् । [उक्यशा<sup>२</sup> यज सोमाना-  
 मिति ।] तदिदमहर्नानन्तेवासिने प्रव्रूयान्नासंवत्सरवासिने नो  
 एवासंवत्सरवासिने नाग्रसंचारिणे नासव्रसंचारिणे नो एवा-  
 सव्रसंचारिणे नानभिप्राप्तायैतं देशम् । न भूयः सकृद्दत्ताङ्गिर्ग-  
 दत्ताद्वा द्वयमेव । एक एकस्मै प्रव्रूयादिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः ।  
 न वत्से च न तृतीय इति । न तिष्ठंस्तिष्ठते न व्रजं व्रजते न  
 शयानः शयानाय नोपर्यासीन उपर्यासीनायाध एवासीनोऽध  
 आसीनाय । नावष्टब्धो न प्रतिस्तब्धो नातिवीतो नाङ्कः कृत्वो-  
 ध्वंश्चुरनपश्चितोऽधीयीत न मांसं भुक्त्वा न लोहितं दृष्ट्वा न  
 गतासुं नाग्रत्यमाक्रम्य नाङ्का नाभ्यज्य नोन्मर्दनं कारयित्वा न  
 नापितेन कारयित्वा न स्नात्वा न वर्णकेनानुलिप्य न स्रजम-  
 पिनक्ष न स्त्रियमुपगम्य नोल्लिख्य नाविलिख्य । नेदमेकस्मि-  
 न्नहनि समापयेदिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः समापयेदिति गालवो  
 यदन्यत्प्राकृचाशीतिभ्यः<sup>३</sup> समापयेदेवेत्याग्निवेश्यायनोऽन्यमन्य-  
 स्मिन्देष्टे शमयमान इति । यचेदमधीयीत न तच्चान्यदधीयीत  
 यच्च त्वन्यदधीयीत काममिदं तच्चाधीयीत । नेदमनधीयन्त्वातको  
 भवति यद्यप्यन्यद्वदधीयान्वेदमनधीयन्त्वातको भवति । ना-

<sup>१</sup> This sentence is of doubtful authenticity, see explanatory notes

<sup>२</sup> स नरा ३.

<sup>३</sup> This occurs in all the MSS. of the text, but was clearly not read by Śāṅga, and occurs in none of the MSS. of Śāṅga



स्मादधीतात्ममाद्येद्यप्यन्यस्मात्प्रमाद्येनैवास्मात्प्रमाद्येनो एवा-  
 स्मात्प्रमाद्येत् । अस्माच्चेन्न प्रमाद्येदलमात्मन इति विद्यात् ।  
 अलं सत्यं विद्यात् । नेदंविदन्तिदंविदा समुद्दिशेन्न सह-भुञ्जीत  
 न सधमादी स्यात् । अथातः स्वाध्यायधर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः ।  
 उप पुराणेनापीते कक्षोदके पूर्वाह्णे न संभिन्नासु छायास्व-  
 पराह्णे नाध्यूह्य मेघेऽपतौ वर्षे चिराच्च वैदिकेनाध्यायेनान्त-  
 रियान्नास्मिन्कथां वदेत् नास्य रात्रौ चन चिकीर्तयिषेत् ।  
 तदिति वा एतस्य महतो भूतस्य नाम भवति योऽस्यैतदेवं  
 नाम वेद ब्रह्म भवति ब्रह्म भवति ॥३॥<sup>६</sup>

॥ इत्यितरेयमञ्चमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥<sup>७</sup>

॥ इति पञ्चमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥<sup>८</sup>

<sup>६</sup> So I conjecture: च कीर्तयिषेत् all MSS. and edd. <sup>७</sup> Numbered 14 in A, E, K, L; 3, 14 in F, G; not numbered in D. <sup>८</sup> Text, A, R; तृतीयोऽध्यायः प्रथमारण्यक-  
 मारण्यं (मारण्य G) पञ्चमारण्यकपर्यन्तं । अष्टादशोऽध्यायः । ओं (om. G) इति आन्त्रजा-  
 यनोत्तरमारण्यकं नाम समाप्तं । F, G; इति पञ्चम आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः । समाप्तं ।  
 K; इति पञ्चमारण्यके । तृतीयोऽध्यायः । इति पञ्चमारण्यकं समाप्तं । L; इति तृतीयो  
 अध्यायः । इति पञ्चमारण्यः । समाप्तः । D D has २४ हरिः ओं । अपिर्धे देवानां-  
 मवमो विष्णुः परमः (the beginning of the Atareya Brāhmana, which presumably once  
 in this MS followed the Āraṇyaka) । नादीचितो महाव्रतं शंसेत् । सूर्वा लोकागामसि ।  
 ऊरु इन्द्रापी युवं मु न इति । श्रीणिही नृचाशीतिः । बार्हती नृचाशीतिः । गायत्री  
 नृचाशीतिः । राघवन्तरो दक्षिणः पयः । गीवाः यक्षेदमारजः । तदिदास भुवनेषु षष्ठं तं  
 मु ते कीर्ति मधवमहिला । प्रक्षोतारं संशास्ति । निधिते प्रेङ्गे होता । यथेत् सदः  
 प्रसर्पति । उपास्ति स्तोत्रे । महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं शमिधेयः । महाव्रतस्य पट् ।  
 शीयाः सप्त । ऊरु वयः । महाव्रतस्य श्रीणिही चत्वारि । इति पञ्चमारण्यं समाप्तम् ।  
 आरण्यपञ्चकं समाप्तम् । हरिः ओम् । See also the note on I, 1, 1. K sums up

the number of Khandas thus. खड ३५ म २२ द्वि २६ तृ १२ च १ प १४ ।<sup>1</sup> At the end of the Āranyaka S adds a second set of Sānti Mantras, see on I, 1, 1. Similarly in the Anandasrama edition, 1895, of thirty two Upanisads there is prefixed to the Kausitaki Upanisad, and also appended to it, a set of Sānti Mantras, similar to those in Aitareya Āranyaka, II, 7, and Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII, 1.

# AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA

## TRANSLATION AND NOTES

### ĀRANYAKA I

#### ADHYĀTA 1.

Now begins the Mahāvratā<sup>1</sup> rite. Indra having slain Vṛtra became great. When he became great, then there came into being the Mahāvratā. Therefore the Mahāvratā ceremony bears the name of Mahāvratā. Some<sup>2</sup> say the priest should make two recitations with the ghee-offering for that day, but the established rule is one. He who desires prosperity should use the hymn, 'To Agni, to this god of yours, (I sing aloud)' (RV., III, 13). He who desires increase should use the hymn, 'The guest of all your folk' (RV., VIII, 74). For the folk indeed are increase and therefore he gains increase.<sup>3</sup> Some say that one should not use that

<sup>1</sup> The term *mahāvratā* is, Śāyana points out, explained by the Taittirīya school in three ways, either *mahān bhavaty anena vratena* or *mahate devasya vratam* or *mahat ca tad vratam*. The Chandogya give the latter two explanations. See Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 1, and Śāyana, ad loc. For the whole, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 21, 1; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 5, 5, 31; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 4, 1, 21, 22; *Pri. Lex.*, s.v.

<sup>2</sup> The two Ājyas recommended are RV., VIII, 11 and VII, 1; the reference is to the view of the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, I, 2. The former is the *prākṛta* because it is an Ājya Śāstra in the Agnistoma, the latter the *zakṛta* because it is an Ājya Śāstra in the Vīśvajit (see Kauṣṭhīki Brāhmaṇa, XXV, 11). The Aitareya holds that only the *zakṛta*, VII, 1, should be employed, according to Śāyana because the Agnistoma which is the *prākṛta* has twelve Śāstras, and if there were two Ājya Śāstras the Mahāvratā would have thirteen. VII, 1, which is the Ājya Śāstra, is also at the same time a *śāntya* *agnyaśāstra* used by those who desire proper food (see I, 1, 2).

<sup>3</sup> This is the rendering adopted by Max Müller from Śāyana, who explains that Varṇas making large earnings offer much taxation (*karam aṣṭa bhakuloṣṭha prayachanta*, which Max Müller takes as 'increase their capital', but this is in view of *prayachanta* (Śāyana on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 29) hardly possible). Perhaps it would be possible to translate: 'For he (Agni) is the increase of the folk and so he (the sacrificer) becomes prosperous,' but it is probable that the commentator has preserved the correct rendering, though of course in the original the *visṭa* *visṭa* is in the genitive. For taxation, cf. Fick, *Die sociale Gliederung*, pp. 39, 80; Rhys Davids, *Indische India*, p. 48; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, II, 10, 26, 9, &c. Already in the RV., I, 65, 7 (see Oldenberg, *S B E.*, XLVI, 56, and Fickel, *Veitische Studien*, I, xvi) the king devours the rich. In a series of passages (XI, 5, 7, 1; XIII, 5, 4, 24; XIII, 1, 5; 43 V, 4, 2, 3) in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, cited by Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 173, 174) the king receives the people, save only the Brahmins, as his food, because they pay him taxes. So often in the epic the exactions of kings are mentioned, cf. Hopkins, *India Old and New*, pp. 240, 243, n. 3; Keith, *Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka*, p. 68.





2 He who desires proper food<sup>1</sup> should use the hymn, 'Agni men kindle from the twigs with splendour' (RV, VII, 1)<sup>2</sup> For Agni is the eater of food In the other chants accompanying the ghee offerings men approach  $\equiv$  it were more slowly to Agni, but here they come upon Agni at the very beginning, at the very beginning he<sup>3</sup> obtains proper food, at the very beginning they smite away

of the text in the Āranyaka thus *glam vadisyams satyam vadisyami<sup>1</sup> adadhām mana isiram caksuh<sup>1</sup> suryo jyotīsam brestho<sup>1</sup> dīkṣe ma ma hanuṣ<sup>1</sup>* Other verses are prescribed to precede *adadhām*, &c., in the case of the Śakvatis and of the Mālavatis the Manthā (Sāṅkhayana Āranyaka, IX), &c. In Khanda 5 are given the expiatory formulae *udatāḥ sukriyam dadhe<sup>1</sup> kad aham atmanā dadhe<sup>1</sup>* and then other differing formulae (see Oldenberg's ed. pp. 163 sq. and *S B E*, XLIV, 143 sq.) Oldenberg reads *udatāḥ*, &c., as 'From here I take out the brightness (I)', but I would much rather take *udatāḥ* (and the version in the Anandakrama ed., p. 295 accents *udatāḥ*) as 'He, arisen gives forth brightness. That (brightness) I appropriate to myself', referring to the beneficial and purifying effects of the radiance of the sun (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 31) Oldenberg also takes *suryo*, &c., as predicate to *adadhām*, &c., which is hardly necessary The phrase *sarvāḥ*, &c., probably means 'I arise whole (possibly with a suggestion of *śakvaḥ* i.e. complete, perfect healthy) with breath, with strength, may prosperity attend me, may the gods attend me.' The assertion *atmānam*, may be based on the magic principle exhibited in faith cures. The other clauses offer no difficulty, but *dāmanam*, &c. is obscure *agu* (unaccented in R) may be nom. to *apasyat*, *namāḥ* being interjected, but this is very unlikely, as *agne is* occurs alone (see Crit. Note) It may be, 'Honour (to thee), O Agni, and oblation, but this is merely possible

In the Manava Śrauta Sutra, II, 2, 36 (cited by Bloomfield, *edic Concordances* pp. 40<sup>b</sup>, 48<sup>a</sup>) occurs *adadhām caksur arisam manāḥ suryo jyotiḥ am bra śāh dīkṣe ma mī hanu satya*, which illustrates the position here of *caksuh* In Taittiriya Samhita, III 2, 1, 2 *dīkṣe ma ma hanu* occurs The exact words used here are found in Sāṅkhayana Āranyaka, VII, 2, 17, 1

<sup>1</sup> Sayana explains *annadya* as a compound of *anna* and *adya* Max Müller follows this view, cf. Monier Williams *Dict.* s.v. *adya* But it is surely preferable all through to take it as an abstract of *annāḥ*, an eater of food, with the sense 'eating of food' which passes into the idea 'food', or 'proper food', as *annāḥ* has the force of 'a healthy man' For the formation see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1212 Oertel on Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 21, 10, reads 'food eating'

<sup>2</sup> Sayana points out that the hymn is both a *vidya* and a *śīmva* hymn It is hardly correct to say, as Max Müller does that it is an obligatory part of the sacrifice, since as we have seen in I 1, 1, the *śīmvasuktāns* are sufficient to complete the ceremony What Sayana means is that it is both the normal form and also a form for a special purpose He compares the use of *adāḥ* in the Agnihotra both as normal and where strength is desired, and the use of *ādadhā* in the Agrosomyaspuṣa rite as normal and when might is wished The possible forms then are (1) this hymn as normal, (2) this hymn as *annadyatima* (3) any of the other *śīmvasuktāns* enumerated in I, 1, 1 In RV, VIII, 1, vv. 1-18 are in triṣṭup metre, the rest in *brahṇāḥ*, which explains the reference to these metres below

<sup>3</sup> The distinction between 'he' and 'they' is no doubt deliberate 'He' corresponds to *annadyakṣuh* and 'they' to *agachauḥ* Sayana explains the singular by *nyamānasaḥśāḥ*, but this is unnecessary Max Müller reads 'he' in each case R reads *adyaḥ*, which is a correction probably of his own, for the *samjāḥ* of most of the MSS. including S'S'S', but is of course most unfortunate *Tea* is almost equivalent to *eva*, cf. Delbrück, *Atindische*

evil. Because of the words (RV., VII, 1, 1<sup>b</sup>), 'with moving of the arms they bring to birth' Agni, the hymn has the word 'birth' in it. Verily the sacrificer is born from this day, and so the hymn has the word 'birth'. There are four verses (in the *tristubh*), cattle are four-footed, the verses serve to win cattle. There are three verses (in the *tristubh*), these are the threefold worlds, the verses serve to gain these worlds. These two verses form a support. Man has a double support, cattle have four feet. The hymn places the sacrificer with his double support among the four-footed cattle.<sup>6</sup> The verses if said straight on number twenty-five. Man consists of twenty-five elements. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty-fifth. By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further, this day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn<sup>7</sup> of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like. So the two are<sup>7</sup> twenty-five. By repeating the first thrice, and the last thrice, the verses

*Syntax*, p. 477; *Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 230, and *Schielowski, Die Apokryphen des Agveda*, p. 79 who calls this use late, hardly correctly. Cf. III, 2, 6; II 1, 2, 6, 1, Aufrecht, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 430. I think that it is most originally—or at any rate quite early—have had a sense approaching more or less to *eva*. Cf. RV., I, 145, 3 *ān it prechati na sind ul pychati nīchra dīra mīnasa yid āgrāhit*. The sense is hardly 'by his own mind alone', as Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 164) takes it. The phrase is softened by *iva*, just as metaphorical phrases are softened by *quasi*, &c. in Latin (*Berger, Stylistique Latine* p. 140). This sense appears clearly in III, 2, 6 *śūgrahmanam upodakharati*. This avoids amendment to *eva* as proposed for the RV. passage by Oldenberg. So in RV., IV, 5, 8 *var iva*. See also Lgeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 375, n. 2, on Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 5, 3, 1, 'Snyasa seems to take "iva" here in the sense of "eva", as indeed it often has to be taken, especially in negative sentences.' The real sense is clearly seen in phrases like *pratarani iva āryante*, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 48, 4. See also n. 5 on II, 1, 2. So in Bhādaranyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 2, 2, for the Kanva text *eva*, the Madhyandina has *iva* explained as *eva* by the commentator (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 159, n. 3), *ibid*, III, 9, 28 5, for the Kanva *iva tar*, the Madhyandina has *iva tar* (*S B E*, XV, 150, n. 5). This use is not found in independent passages of the Śākhayana Aranyaka, where in VIII, 10, *eva* takes the place of *eva* in *Āitareya Aranyaka*, III, 2, 6. Cf. also Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, LXXI, 824 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Sayana is probably correct in taking *janayanta* in a timeless or present sense. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930, Avery, *J A O S*, XI, 326-361.

<sup>7</sup> The hymn has two metres and in one of these metres four feet, man has two and cattle four feet, and the union in the hymn produces union in reality *catuṣpadi* occurs also in *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VI, 2, 7, where the whole phrase occurs with *padah*. For *catuṣpadah palarah* cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 2, 20, and often in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. The whole phrase is also identical with *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 31, 23, &c.

<sup>8</sup> For this see I, 1, 4, II, 3, 4, Śākhayana Aranyaka, I, 1. The reference is to the *śākhayana stoma* in the Pṛṣṭha Śrauta corresponding to the Mahadukṣha.

<sup>9</sup> The plural is explained by Sayana as due to the *ya* being thought of and not the hymn, but here the 'attraction' of the predicate is an adequate explanation, since such examples of carelessness are very rare. Cf., however, RV., III, 6, 3, where Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 24, 6) refers *jayatīyarah* to Heaven and Earth, RV., II, 5, 6 (*ibid*, 204), RV., VII, 93, 7. *yāt imi āgar cakreṇ tāt imi ayā tāt aryamādati śrābhāntu*! where Agni and perhaps the other

become thirty less one, that is equivalent to a *viraj* verse minus one syllable. For in the small (womb) seed is deposited,<sup>9</sup> in the small (heart) the vital spirits, in the small (stomach) food is placed. So (the *viraj* small by one) serves for the attainment of these desires. He who knows this obtains those desires. The verses include also the *brhātī* metre<sup>10</sup> and the *viraj* metre, and the perfection of that day. They also include the *anustubh* metre,<sup>11</sup> for the chants accompanying the ghee offerings depend on *anustubh*.<sup>12</sup>

3 'The Prauga' should be in the *gāyatrī* metre,<sup>13</sup> some say,<sup>14</sup> 'for the *gāyatrī* is brightness and splendour and thus (the sacrificer) becomes bright and splendid.' Others say, 'The Prauga should be in the *usnīh* metre, for the *usnīh* is life

Adityas are in the mind of the poet. Ibid., II, 85-47 (altered in Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, I 8, 9), *Ārdayanti* is used of a man and wife. In *Mātrāyaṇya Saṃhitā*, I, 5, 12, *śrīpavāha* is used of the gods of *brāhmanas* in IV, 1, *infra*. Cf. too the verse cited V, 2, 2 *nam na Mitravaruna karānāṃ* and Atharvaveda XIV, 1, 39, with Whitney's note. Cf. Delbrück *Altindische Syntax*, p. 102, Speyer, *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 26 n., Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XXXIX, 62, n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> See I, 3-7 where this recurs.

<sup>10</sup> The verses taken together make up eighteen *viraj* verses (it is not necessary to assume the repetition of the first *viraj* thrice as does Mac Muller), and seven *anustubh* verses. Repeating thrice the last *anustubh*, and taking away eight syllables from each verse, we reach nine *brhātī* verses plus nine sets of eight syllables which taken all together are two *brhātī* verses. Cf. Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 2.

<sup>11</sup> The first verse, though called *viraj* in the Anukramanā, is really a verse of thirty-three syllables and by the doctrine that one or two syllables make no difference, it can easily be regarded as an *anustubh* of thirty-two syllables. The acc. is due to the force of *adhi*, cf. *janitvān adhi dāmbhānāṃ*, RV, V 18-8 as explained by Whitney, *A J P*, VIII, 297 and Geldner *Indische Studien* II 306. Later *adhi* governs the acc., see Hopkins *Great Epics of India* pp. 265, 473. For the exact sense of *adhi* cf. *adhi samantāt*, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 2, 4-1 with Eggeling's note, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* III 22-6 *virajam dānān na adharapadye* *śam*, and elsewhere in the Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra literature.

<sup>12</sup> Ājya here, as above must mean Ājya Śāstra as Sayana takes it. The reference is to RV, III, 13 which is an *anustubh* hymn and is the Ājya Śāstra of the Agnistoma.

<sup>13</sup> After the ending of the *pragāḥas* and the recitation of the Ājya Śāstra comes the *Viśva devagrāha* and the Prauga. In the *pragāḥas* the Agnistoma the Prauga consists of seven *īritas*, comprising RV I 2, and 3 ascribed to the poet Madhuchandas, in the Śaṅkhayana Brāhmaṇa, V 5. The Aitareya Āranyaka keeps these *īritas* for the Prauga, in the Śaṅkhayana there is used a set apparently of seven *īritas* (RV, VII, 95, 1-3, 4-6, VIII 61, 1-3, IV, 43 1-3, IV, 23 1-3, IV, 55 1-3, VII, 95, 4-6), in the *anustubh* metre, ascribed to Vāmadeva *Ānāṣṭupyaṇya* though only three are his (Gowda on Śaṅkhayana Śrāuta Sūtra II 8, 10). The series of deities, Vāyu, Indra Vāyu Mitra Varuna Aśvman Indra, Visvedevāḥ Sarasvatī is the same as in the original *īritas* of RV, I 2, 3. There can be no doubt that the Śaṅkhayana version is the later. The order of the *grāhas* is different in Kātyāyana Śrāuta Sūtra, IX, 13, 33. For the metres and their relation to the *śāntas* see Bergaigne *Journal Asiatique*, VIII, 266 sq., Bloomfield *J A O S*, XVI, 4 sq., Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 301.

<sup>14</sup> The *anustubh* Prauga is preferred in the Śaṅkhayana, but nothing is there said as to the reason here given, while arguments for the *gāyatrī* are there mentioned, which here are not used. This adds another reason for regarding the Śaṅkhayana as the later version.





rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Prauḡa)<sup>11</sup> — their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this Prauḡa.

4 (There is the word 'ready' in the verse,) 'Come hither, O Vāyu, conspicuous, these Soma draughts have been made ready' (RV, I, 2, 1), this day indeed is ready for the sacrificer and for the gods. Truly the day is ready for him who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. In the verse, 'Indra and Vayu, these draughts are poured forth, come to what is prepared' (RV, I, 2, 4) by 'prepared' (*niskṛta*) he denotes what is 'well prepared' (*samskṛta*)<sup>12</sup>. Indra and Vayu approach what has been well prepared by him who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. In the verse, 'Mitra of holy might I summon (and Varuna) who make perfect<sup>3</sup> the oil fed rite' (RV, I, 2, 7<sup>40</sup>), speech is the oil  $\bar{m}$  r'e Speech  $\bar{m}$  has who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. In the verse 'Aśvins (accept) the sacrificial offerings' (RV, I, 3, 1<sup>4</sup>), the sacrificial offerings are food and this serves to gain food. The Aśvins go to the sacrifice of him who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites the verse, 'Come hither, ye whose path is red'<sup>5</sup> (RV, I, 3, 3). In the verses, 'Indra of bright splendour, come hither, Indra impelled by prayer, come hither, Indra hastening, come hither' (RV, I, 3, 5<sup>6</sup>, 6<sup>6</sup>, 4<sup>6</sup>), he recites, 'Come hither, come hither'. Indra goes to his sacrifice who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. The All-gods come to the call of him who knows,

It is a curious inversion of ideas by which the old popular rites retained no doubt reluctantly in the ritual become regarded as improper and needing atonement.

<sup>11</sup> Max Müller takes *prastūṭhādikāḥ* as separate from *śantyaṃ* but suggests that *śāntāḥ* may go with *śantyaṃ*. This certainly seems better, as it avoids the identification of *śāntāḥ* and *śantāḥ*. 'At the end' refers to the fact that the Mahāvratā is the last day but one of the Saitra. For *prastūṭhā* as a medical term see Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907, p. 24.

<sup>12</sup> From *niskṛta* comes the Vedic *niskṛta* according to Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, xxvi. For *samskṛta* as 'well cooked', see Thomas, *J R A S*, 1904, p. 243, Hirste, *J R A S*, 1905, p. 353. For *śāntā* and *śānt* cf. Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 2, 4. For *aram* above, which  $\bar{m}$  against *alam*, *śāntā*, 2, 3, is a sign of early date, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 211 sq., Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 43 sq. *alam* already appears in the Atharvaveda. The syntax  $\bar{m}$  normal, see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* pp. 146-147. Sayana, probably correctly, explains that the hymn has the word *aram* because the day  $\bar{m}$  *aram*, not vice versa. The use of *rai* favours this.

<sup>13</sup> Sayana interprets *śāntāḥ* either as dual or as equivalent to *śāntayantam*. In the original the *śāntāḥ* has *śāntāṃ* or *śāntāṃ* (cf. Fickel, *Vedic Studies* III, 190).

<sup>14</sup> This is the most probable interpretation of *Rudraśāntāṃ*, Fickel, *Vedic Studies* I, 33, but of III 71, Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 49. Others take as 'whose path is terrible'. Sayana renders 'whose path is like that of Rudra unobstructed'. According to R's division, here and above, *śāntā* must be taken as 'He says' (the verse), but the position of *aryā* is hardly possible and the later examples show conclusively that *śāntā* goes with what follows, as  $\bar{m}$  is taken in S.

or for whom = Hotr priest who knows recites the verse, 'Ye All gods, protectors, supporters of men, come hither' (RV, I, 3, 7). In the verse, 'Ye givers, (come to) the libation of the giver' (RV, I, 3, 7c), he means the libation of every giver. Whatever = man wishes when he recites this verse, that wish the gods fulfil, if this he knows or if for him = Hotr priest who knows recites. In the verse, 'May the holy<sup>4</sup> Sarasvatī accept our sacrifice, she that is rich in prayer' (RV, I, 3, 10), speech is denoted by 'rich in prayer'. Speech is his who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites. When he says, 'May she accept our sacrifice,' he means, 'May she bear it away'. These verses if said straight on number twenty-one<sup>5</sup>. Man consists of twenty-one elements. He has ten fingers, ten toes, and the trunk is the twenty first. By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-first. By repeating the first thrice and the last thrice the verses become twenty five. The trunk is the twenty fifth, and Prajapati is the twenty fifth. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth. By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty five, the *stoma* hymn of that day is twenty five,<sup>6</sup> like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty-five.

### ADHYATA 2

The two tristichs, 'Thee I like a car to aid us' (RV, VIII, 68, 1-3), and, 'This juice is poured, O Vasu' (RV, VIII, 2, 1-3) are the first and second of the Marutvatiya hymn<sup>7</sup>. Both are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremony<sup>8</sup>. Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and (the Marutvatiya) is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Marutvatiya) as their rest. He rests who knows this and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this Marutvatiya. In the verse, 'Indra, come

<sup>4</sup> Probably the original form was *parokṣ* Arnold *Vedic Metre*, p 143, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xi, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, § 110.

<sup>5</sup> Cf I, 1, 2 ad fin.

<sup>6</sup> The *stoma* peculiar to the Mahāvrat is the *pañcavimsa stoma* in the *rajanā* melody in the Prṣṭha Stotra corresponding to the Mahaduktā, Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 7 3, 4. The explanation of 'Prajapati' as twenty-fifth is variously given, cf 'Nirukṣaṇa' note on Sankhayana Āraṇyaka I, 1, and see also below, II, 2 4.

<sup>7</sup> This is the first Śastra at the midday pressing. The *pragathas* used are made up of two verses expanded (Sayana *parasmaipada vyasamukhe pragathānena tasya sampadyate sa yam pragathā*). The *dharmas* are interpolated verses to fill up the Śastra. For the terminology, *pragathā* and *anukāra*, see Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p 103. For *vāṇas* below, see Eggeling, *S E E*, XII, xx-xv.

<sup>8</sup> See I, 1, 3.

nigher, with thy strengths preserve thy singers"<sup>2</sup> (RV, VIII, 53, 5-6) (there is the word 'singers'), this day indeed is a hymn, and being possessed of a hymn, the form of this day is perfect (There is the word 'hero') in the verse, 'Let Brahmanaspati come forth, hither the hero' (RV, I, 40, 3<sup>4c</sup>), the form of this day indeed is perfect is endowed with strength (There is the word 'heroic might') in the verse, 'Rise up, O Brahmanaspati, heroic might' (RV, I, 40, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>b</sup>), the form of this day is perfect as endowed with might (There is the word 'hymn') in the verse, 'Now doth Brahmanaspati proclaim the hymn of praise' (RV, I, 40, 5), this day indeed is a hymn and the form of this day as endowed with a hymn is perfect (There is the word 'slaying Vritra') in the verse, 'Agni, the slayer of Vritra, will bear' (RV, III, 20, 4<sup>3c</sup>), the slaying of Vritra is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'Thou art strong by insight, O Soma, thou art mighty in thy might and greatness' (RV, I, 91, 2<sup>3c</sup>), might indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'They fill full the waters, they lead forth the strong one like a horse for rain' (RV, I, 64, 6<sup>d</sup>), strength indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. Further in that verse, 'They milk the thundering never failing spring' (RV, I, 64, 6) (there is the word 'thundering'), thundering indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'To great Indra' (RV, VIII, 89, 3), what indeed is great, is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect. (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'Sing a great song to Indra' (RV, VIII, 89, 1), what indeed is great is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect (There are the words 'was in the way of' and 'stayed not') in the verse, 'No one was in the way of, none stayed, the chariot of

<sup>2</sup> Sayana takes *prāsūta* as a noun = *anugṛāha dāya*

<sup>3</sup> This is I take it, the meaning. The verses contain words because the day has certain qualities. It is also possible to invert the relation, and derive from the epithets in the verses the qualities of the day but the position of the verse in the sentence points to the former interpretation as slightly the more probable, and that view is supported by Śaṅkharāyaṇa Āranyaka, I, 3 ad fin. *matolāva hy etad aśaś*. The literal version is 'As to the words, &c.'

<sup>4</sup> The argument seems to be (1) *Vytraha* occurs in the verse, because (2) Indra is *Vytraha*, and (3) the day is Indra's. Possibly it may be, because the word *Vytraha* occurs, therefore, Indra is *Vytraha* and this is Indra's day.

<sup>5</sup> *vajinas* means 'having food' according to Sayana. It clearly meant originally 'having energy'. Cf. Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 18 and Index, s. v. *vja*, Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 10, 45.

<sup>6</sup> Sayana renders *parjaya* as *svartham na calatam* and *na siramad* as *tena rakṣena rananam aya* *śatru* = *śatranam*, and *parjastat* as *lobhināragaman* *ya parita'calamaya*. It is difficult not to believe that this absurd interpretation, which is that of the Āranyaka, was

Sudās' (RV., VII, 32, 10); the form of this day as endowed with the terms *parjastā* and *rānti* in perfect. He recites all the Pragāthas to obtain all the days, all the Ukthas,<sup>1</sup> all the Pṛsthas,<sup>2</sup> all the Śāstras, all the Praūgas, all the pressings of the Soma.

2. He recites<sup>3</sup> the hymn, 'Fair has been my effort, singer; slayer of truth' (RV., X, 27). True, indeed, is this day and perfect its form as endowed with truth. This hymn is composed by Vasukra. Vasukra indeed is *brahman*, and this day is *brahman*. Thus by *brahman* is *brahman* commenced. Here they ask: 'Why then is the Marutvatīya Śāstra commenced by Vasukra's hymn?' Because no other than Vasukra produced<sup>4</sup> a Marutvatīya Śāstra nor separated it. Therefore by the hymn of Vasukra the Marutvatīya Śāstra is commenced. This hymn is not addressed to any definite deity<sup>5</sup> and is therefore Prajāpati's. For Prajāpati is undefined, and the hymn serves to win Prajāpati. Once<sup>6</sup> he describes Indra, and so the hymn retains its form as Indra's. He recites the hymn, 'Drink the Soma, for which in anger thou breakest' (RV., VI, 17) (There is the word 'mighty') in the verse, 'The cow stall, Indra, mightily being lauded;' the form of this day as endowed with the word mightily<sup>7</sup> is perfect. This hymn is

deliberately chosen wrongly. The exact sense of the original is, however, open to doubt, cf. Ludwig and Griffith's translations.

<sup>1</sup> The Ukthas here meant, Śāyana says, are those for the *ukthyakratu*, following the Yajñyapalya Śiman. The Pṛsthas are the four Pṛstha Stotras of the midday pressing. The Śāstras are those of the Ājya and other rites. The Praūgas are the Śāstras of the Prauga and are specially mentioned on the *nyāya*, *brahmanāḥ dīgataḥ parurājakā aya dīgataḥ* (so Ś; R reads *abhy*<sup>2</sup>, which is nonsense).

<sup>2</sup> For these, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 339. For *aptyas* and the very numerous similar datives, cf. Speiser, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 274; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970. They differ from ordinary infinitives in not being construed clearly as verbal forms, but governing the genitive as here and in Śaikhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 5, 6, &c., and as always in Celtic (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 535).

<sup>3</sup> This Khanda contains the general form as well as the specifically Mahāvata part of the Marutvatīya. See on V, 2, 1, which gives only the special part, and cf. Śaikhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 3, where Vasukra is equated to Indra. He occurs also in Bṛhaddevatī, VII, 30, &c.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. brought out of the Samhitā. The perf. here has a certain propriety, it expresses a relation not exactly that of mere past, and approximates to a present. Cf. n. 6. For *athā karmāt*, cf. Altareya Brāhmana, III, 24, 7, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Macdonell, *Sarvanukramanī*, p. 183, *Bṛhaddevatī*, II, 256, Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rigveda*, pp. 7, 8. See Altareya Brāhmana, III, 30, 3. *Ita et dhāgye anurukto Prajāpati*, VI, 20, 18; Kaṣṭhaki Brāhmana, XXIII, 2; Maitrīyaṇī Samhitā, III, 6, 5; Nirukta, VII, 4. Śāyana says Prajāpati is *anurukto* as he has no *mūrti*. Śaikhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1 has: *anurukto vai Prajāpatiḥ*. Cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 333; Lévy, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> In RV., X, 27, 22. The Bṛhaddevatī and Sarvanukramanī ascribe X, 27-29 generally to Indra, with certain exceptions (Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatī*, I, 127).

<sup>7</sup> Clearly the Āraṇyaka takes *śaśā* as an accusative-*śaśāś*, and presumably, like Śāyana, *grāṇas* in active. *Śāśā* in the original is taken by Griffith in his translation as a vocative from

composed by Bharadvāja, and Bharadvāja was of seers the most learned, the longest lived, and the greatest practiser of austerities. By this hymn he drove away evil. When\* therefore a man recites the hymn of Bharadvāja, it is that

*maññ* against the accent. Cf. also Grassmann and Ludwig's translations. For the passive sense of *grñna* cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 362, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 264.

\* The form *apahatyā* may be either a dative, 'for the driving away,' or an ablative, more probably the latter, as presumably the sense is that Bharadvāja attained his length of years by the hymn rather than the reverse. *das* above = clearly differentiated in time from the narrative, cf. Śaṅkhāyana Aranyaka, VI 1, where the imperfect *anasat* describes the dwelling from time to time of Gargya Balaḥ, while *asa* is used to denote his permanent character, and *asana* in describing his conversation with Ajitakratu. This use of the perfect as a narrative tense = not a sign of lateness when the use is different from that of the imperfect. In the Tandyā Mahābrahmana itself *asana* and *asa* (XIII, 6 9) are both found in such cases. Cf. also Aitareya Brahmana, III, 48, 5. *Bharadvāja ha vas kṛta dīrghak pāṭha asa* i.e. 'dravet', and III, 48, 4. The position of the Aitareya Brahmana and Aranyaka as early appear clearly from the following table of the proportion of perfects to imperfects (see Whitney, *P A O S*, May, 1891, pp. lxxxv sq., slightly modified) —

Tandyā Mahābrahmana, I	130
Taittiriya Saṃhitā, I	70
Maitrayāya Saṃhitā, I	64
Taittiriya Brahmana, I	30
Taittiriya Aranyaka, I	9
Śatapatha Brahmana, VI-VIII, I	30, I V,
	9 I I
" " XIII, I	5 XI 5 4
" " IX, I	5, XIV, 7 5
" " X, I	3, (incl. ag
Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad)	

Śatapatha Brahmana XII, I	2
Jaiminiya Brahmana, I	4
Gopatha Brahmana, II, I	5
" " I	2
Kaṇvaśākhā Brahmana, I	3
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I	1
Aitareya Brahmana, I IV, I	40
" " V, I	16
" " VI, I	2
" " VII, I	4
" " VIII, I	5

The earlier part of the Aitareya (I XXVI) can thus claim to be older than anything save the Taittiriya and the Saṃhitās and may be as old (for in such small matters = those of the Aitareya the proportions are not fair) as the Saṃhitās (Brahmana parts of course). Against this sporadic cases like *sam lakṣe*, *lajjate*, *sacra* (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 222) cannot be regarded as of decisive weight. *lajjamaṇ* indeed as a Prakritism\* would be note

\* Fick *Deus Besti*, VII, 270 takes *lajj* from Ind. Germ. *lag\** according to the ordinary and early phonetic rule, if so the Prakritism would disappear. The view of Leumann (Wackernagel, I, 220) is, however, more probable, cf. also Dr. Scheffelowitz's forthcoming book, *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* § 10. Dr. Scheffelowitz gives an interesting example of the way in which the texts were corrupted (though he does not apply it for this purpose). In later Vedic times *ts* and *ks* became frequently *ck*, and such forms found their way into the text of old work instead of the proper forms. Later still efforts were made to replace correct forms instead of obvious Prakritisms with in some cases unfortunate results. E.g. in Samaveda, I 3, I, 4 9 (= I, 231) *pyśm* as Benky (*Glossar*, p. 228) says is for RV, VIII, 31, 15 *pyśm* via *pyśm*. So may be explained *akṣra* Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 2 (cf. *Andivāla* ed., p. 428), for *akṣra* (K + *akṣra*). Cf. in Naighantika, II, 27, *pyśmāḥ* (cf. Roth's crit. note, p. 16) for IV *pyśm*, and for *pyśm* (K Z, XI, 264 sq.) the MSS. of Atharvaveda, X, 9, 27, offer either *pyśm* or *pyśm* (Leumann, *Album Kern*,

he may become, by the driving away of evil, learned, long-lived, and versed in asceticism; for that he recites the hymn of Bharadvāja. He recites the hymn, 'With what splendour do ye who are of equal age and dwell together?' (RV., I, 165). (There is the word 'praises') in the verse, 'They call for me, the praises long for me' (RV., I, 165, 4°); this day is praise and the form of this day as endowed with praise is perfect. This is the *ayāśubhija* hymn,<sup>2</sup> and it is harmony and

worthy, but when II is considered that the form is unique (III, 23, 7), that the later language had always *ayaj* and that *ayā* was a common word, there can surely be no hesitation in restoring *ayāmanā*, just as the Atharvan Prāśastya, cited above, must be removed. The exact verbal form of the text cannot always be relied upon, and II may be noted that, as Silyana's note on VII, 10; 11 shows, in his time some versions of the Aitareya Brāhmana had, which some had not, these chapters, of which the second is a mere corruption of Kaustaki Brāhmana, VII, 11 (see Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmana*, pp. 236, 282, 444). The case of the Gopatha Brāhmana may be held to contradict the deductions here accepted, since Bloomfield (*Atharvaveda*, pp. 164 sq.) has shown grounds for holding that the Pūrva is not later than the Uttara, but this objection is not of importance, since it is the case that the two parts owe most of their grammatical forms to these sources and the Pūrva borrows from the Śatapatha Brāhmana, XI and XII, in the first of which books the number of perfects is very high, while the Uttara exploits the Aitareya, &c. The potential in *āsa* (see Aufrecht, p. 429) also urged as a sign of late date is merely, in all probability, an inaccurate analogical form to forms like *śa* (*dadhata*, &c.), and gives no criterion of date (cf. Liebach, *Pāṇini*, p. 32) *amantrayāsa* *asa* occurs only in VII, 17 and proves nothing for the earlier part of the Brāhmana. Pāṇini, III, 2, 49, allows only *ā* (Liebach, p. 33); but as there can be no doubt of the priority of the Aitareya Brāhmana to Pāṇini (cf. Liebach's own paper, *Beitr. Beitr.*, XI, 309), this clearly shows either the selective character of Pāṇini's work or more probably the incorrect transmission of the text (the Śākhāyana has *āstre*, Liebach, pp. 80, 81). The use of *āśas* (for *āsan*) is apparently a note of the Aitareya Brāhmana's style, not a proof of date.<sup>3</sup> Liebach (p. 30) holds that *asa* was obsolete in Pāṇini's day in prose and says Yaska uses only *bahāśva*. I cannot accept this view as to Pāṇini.

<sup>2</sup> The story of Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts has received full treatment from Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, pp. 108-119). He holds that RV., I, 170, 171, and 165 make up an *ilbhāsa* to the effect that Agastya offered a sacrifice to the Maruts. Indra came and claimed it, and Agastya had to pacify Indra and the Maruts. The result is possible, but not certain. The Kaustaki Brāhmana, XXVI, 9, has (as amended by Sieg, p. 117, n. 7): *dayā lūhā*

p. 307; Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 604). So II *āhils*, I, 2, 9°, MSS. read *prinyants* for *prinyants* and this Prāśastya is found in Varttika 2 to Pāṇini, VII, 3, 37. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 125.

<sup>3</sup> Aufrecht's view (*Aitareya Brāhmana*, p. 11) of the dependence of the Brāhmana parts of the Taittiriya Saṃhitā seems borne out by the citations in his 'Anmerkungen'. It may be noted that the Brāhmana parts of the Saṃhitā cannot well be separated much in point of time from the Brāhmana itself and that Brāhmana deals with the late Perśamedha (Winternitz, *Gesch. der ind. Lit.*, I, 167). Cf. also Taittiriya Saṃhitā, VI, 3, 10, 5 and Taittiriya Brāhmana, I, 5, 6, 6 with Aitareya Brāhmana, VII, 12, 3 (*ibid.*, p. 184, n. 2). Noteworthy also is Winternitz's remark (p. 175, n. 1) that in Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XXX, Buddhists are not mentioned, though that section must be later than the oldest Brāhmana.

abiding, the *kaṣṭhūbha* hymn. For by means of it Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts came to harmony. So the recitation of the *kaṣṭhūbha* hymn tends to harmony. Further the hymn tends to long life. So if the sacrificer be dear to the priest, let him recite for him<sup>8</sup> the *kaṣṭhūbha* hymn. He recites the hymn, 'Indra, with the Maruts, powerful, for joy' (RV., III, 47). There are the words 'Indra, powerful', power indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day = Indra's and Indra's its form. This hymn = composed by Viśvāmitra. Now Viśvāmitra was the friend of all, and all is the friend of him who knows this and of those for whom a Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this hymn. The hymn 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV., X, 73) is one containing *nivṛt*,<sup>9</sup> and, as belonging to the one day ceremonial, is perfect in form. Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and (this hymn) = the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (*nivṛddhana*) as their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom a Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this *nivṛddhana*. If recited straight on, the verses number ninety seven.<sup>10</sup> The ninety is made up of three *trīṇī* sets of thirty, and then

*satayasaḥ saṁśa itī maruṭatayam* | *tas etat saṁjñanam santam suktaṁ* | *etena hendraś ca Maruṭaś ca saṁjñantam*, which must = back to the same source as the Aitareya version, found also in Aitareya Brahmana, V, 16 which agrees verbally with this passage. For *saṁjñana* see also Bloomfield, *Ātharvaveda*, pp 77, 73.

<sup>8</sup> The gen. here is probably possessive and predicative (*eius factus*), cf. Spitzer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, §§ 63 and 71, Liebh, *Ess. Beitr.*, XI, 307 sq., Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 161, while the gen. with *priya* is adnominal and regular from RV. onwards. Not unmetrical is the transition from such genitives to the genitive which is really a dative, e.g. Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 15, 7 *śarya satam datta* would if *śarya* were put for *dattva* be quite regular. On the other hand in *śarya frat daddāti* (ibid., II, 40, 6) the gen. is practically dative. In Pāli (Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, p. 67) and in Prakrit (Pischel, *Prakrit Grammar*, p. 246) the dative of the indirect objective is always represented by the genitive, the dative of purpose alone surviving. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 297. Note the dative with *mātram* below, and genitive in *chetan paśunam*, I, 2, 3, and Geldner, *Pāṇische Studien*, I, 183. On the low morality of the Brahmanas cf. Lévy, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 9, Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 180 sq., Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 62.

<sup>9</sup> In Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, I, 3 the word is in RV., VI, 19, see Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 19, 20. The *pragṛth* is as here ibid., 15, Kausitika Brahmana, XXV, 3. *Atvā* are early and apparently were known in Vedic times, cf. Haug, *Aitareya Brahmana* pp 32 sq., Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, IV, 355, XVIII, 96, Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 387, n. 2, Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, VII, 124 n. 2, Scheffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, pp 136 ff. Here the *atvā* comes in after the sixth verse.

<sup>10</sup> Sayana explains thus the two *trīṇī* referred to in I, 2, 2 = 6, six *pragṛthas* each of two verses made into a *trīṇī* = 18, three *dāhyas* = 3, *asat* = 24, *śrīṇī* = 15, *kaṣṭhūbha* = 15, *maruṭaś* Indra = 5, *paṁsthā* *agraṣṭh* = 11, total 97. But in I, 2, 1 there are seven *pragṛthas* which account for 14 verses. Apparently the author overlooked this although of course the explanations are possible. Oldenberg (*Prolegomena*, § 353) thinks that some of the *pragṛthas* may have been counted as two, others as three verses.



there are seven which are over. Whatever is praise of the seven is also praise of the ninety. If the first and last are repeated thrice the verses number 101. There are five four-jointed<sup>11</sup> fingers, two-pits, the arm, the collar bone, the shoulder-blade; these make up twenty-five. The other parts<sup>12</sup> have twenty-five each, making a hundred, and the trunk is the one hundred and first part. The hundred is life,<sup>13</sup> health, strength, glory; the sacrificer is the hundred and first, resting on life, health, strength, glory. These verses become *trustubh*.<sup>14</sup> For the midday pressing is accompanied by *trustubh* verses.<sup>15</sup>

3 They ask, 'Why is a swing<sup>1</sup> a swing?' He who blows is the swing. He

<sup>11</sup> The four are, according to Śāyana, *agra*, *madhya*, *mala*, *tannūla*, and he notes that though the *angustika* has really only three, it is given a fourth for the sake of symmetry. So in the systems of Caraka and Sūruta (Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp 122, 123) there are sixty phalanges, giving fifteen in each hand. Here the phalanges and the metacarpus are reckoned as phalanges. In Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 3, each *śāsti*, on the other hand, is given three *śardūni*, which is the more correct view, and perhaps later. The expression *kakṣat* is doubtful. It cannot mean 'armpits', for there is but one on each side; Max Müller says the pits 'in the elbow and the arm'; Monier-Williams, *Dict* (where the reference is inaccurate) gives the sense as the two depressions on the wrist, Śāyana says *kakṣya śardū abhayaṃ*, and possibly the *armpit* may be conceived of as in some way double. He takes, followed by Max Müller, *akṣat* = eye, but (a) *śīra* is a separate element and the eye belongs to it; (b) the form is unparalleled. Friedlander holds that *akṣa* (Ar. *akṣ*, Lat. *axilla*, O.H.G. *akṣala*) means 'shoulder blade', but that is the meaning of *apophalata* in the systems of Caraka (Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 13), perhaps of Sūruta and Vāgbhaṭa (*J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 931, *Osteology*, pp 76, 91). *akṣa* must mean 'collar-bone', as I would take it in Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 4 (*akṣat* and *akṣat*) and as in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (*akṣa*). The later form is usually *akṣala*, though *akṣa* is found in the 'non medical version of Ātreya', see Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 53, 134, = 1, and my review, *Z. D. M. G.*, LXII, 135 sq. Śāyana's error is found in the commentators on Yājñavalkya and in the modern translations.

<sup>12</sup> 1 = the left side, and the two sides of the lower body, which have five four-jointed toes, a thigh, a leg, and three *śardūni* ('joints', Max Müller, rather 'articulations', Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 931) according to Śāyana.

<sup>13</sup> Because life is one hundred years and the other things depend upon it, Śāyana explains, probably correctly, as there is no doubt that life as one hundred years is a very early idea, see Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 384 and ref., and Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 193, *Festzug an Roth*, p. 137. Cf. Vajasaneyi Samhita Upaniṣad, 2.

<sup>14</sup> Because the last hymn is *trustubh* (Śāyana). But all the hymns in that Khanda are in *trustubh*.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 12, 3-5, *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, IV, 2, 5, 20, and other passages cited by Bloembergen, *J. A. O. S.*, XVII, 4. For the seven *śardūni*, cf. Wachsmann, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 41; *Z. D. M. G.*, XI, 678.

<sup>1</sup> The use of the swing refers, in the opinion of Oldenberg (*Religion der Veda*, p. 444) to the sun, which is called 'the golden swing in heaven' in RV, VII, 87, 5. This is quite probable, as the Mahāvratā rite is, at least to some extent, a sun charm (cf. *Introd.*, p. 28). Śāyana's interpretation follows the text and makes the swing Vāyu, as does Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 7. I, 2, 4 below is in favour of the sun, cf. *Kaṭhaka Samhitā*, XXXIV, 5, cited in *Int. Stud.*, III, 477. Compare the *śāṅkṣat* of the young hymns, clearly a vegetation rit.

swings forward in these worlds and then is a swing a swing 'There should be one plank,' some say, 'for the wind blows in one way and (the swing should be) like the wind' But this is not to be accepted' Others say, 'There should be three planks, for threefold are these worlds and (the swing should) resemble them' But this is not to be accepted There should be two planks, for these two worlds<sup>2</sup> seem most real, and the ether between them is the sky. So let there be two planks. Let them be of *udumbara* wood<sup>3</sup> The *udumbara* is sap and proper food, and planks of it serve to win sap and proper food. Let them be raised in the middle For in the middle food delights men, and so he places the sacrificer in the middle of proper food. There are two kinds of ropes,<sup>4</sup> the right and the left The right serves for some animals, the left for others. When there are both kinds, they serve to win both kinds of animals. The ropes should be of *darbha*<sup>5</sup> grass For of all plants *darbha* is free of evil,<sup>6</sup> and so they should be of *darbha* grass

<sup>2</sup> This is the constant phrase of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. That of the Kaṭhaka Brāhmaṇa and it may be added of the Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, is *na tad aditya*. Cf. Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* p. 432, Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 38, n. 6, 44 n. 1

<sup>3</sup> The ether or sky is as Sayana points out, invisible. *Adhātama* (for *adhā*, cf. Wachter, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 178, and Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 228) is a curious word, which occurs also in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, which also has, VI, 3, 1, 24, *anādīkajurita*, on which see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 121, n. 1, Eggeling, *S B E*, XLII, 197, Hillebrandt *Ritual Literatur*, p. 167

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, I, 7, where there is one plank only *tad va udumbaram bhavaty ūrg va anmadyam udumbara ūrga nna-hasyop-ītyas*. The seat of the Udgātṛ also is of *udumbara* wood. Tāndya Mahābrāhmaṇa, V, 5, 1 *audumbari bhavaty ūrg udumbara ūrgam anavarundhi*. The Śaṅkhayana passages look like an imitation, while the Aitareya may well have followed the Tāndya (cf. *anavarundhi*). Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 3, has *ūrg va dnam udumdrak*. Cf. also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa III, 2, 1, 23 and often.

<sup>5</sup> Sayana explains right and left as fashioned by the right and left hands respectively, perhaps twisted from left to right and right to left respectively. The plural *rajyasū* is probably due as he says to the fact that as is said in V, 1, 3 *Śaṅkhayana Śranta Sūtra*, XLII, 2, 3, the ropes are each of three strands. It should be noted that Āraṇyaka V differs in the purpose assigned to the ropes which it associates with the holding together of the swing. Similarly it recognises the number of planks as three or two, while two is here prescribed. Again, I, 2, 4 the height of the swing is fixed as a *manu*, while V, 1, 3 gives as alternatives *caturṅgula* or *manu*. These remarks show that the last book must differ considerably in date from the first.

<sup>6</sup> On *darbha* cf. Eggeling *S B E*, VII, 84, Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup> The construct on of the genitive with a positive is based on the analogy of the superlative, e.g. *infra*, I, 2, 4 (Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 65, 91 II). Similarly the ablative is found dependent on a positive, e.g. RV, V, 10, 4 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 390), Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 58, *Sanskrit-Syntax*, p. 73, Delbrück, *Grundriss*, III, 1, 216, Fischel, *Göt. Gel. Anz.*, 1884, p. 509 *Indische Studien*, I, 309 Geldner, *ibid.*, III, 76-77, and see II, 3, 1, n. 6. For the word *apahatāpāpmanā*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 25, 4 *apahatāpāpmanā* and *anapahatāpāpmanā*, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 3, 21 (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 168, n. 3), Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 2, 9, VIII, 1, 5, 4, 1, 7, 1

they<sup>7</sup> mount to food and fortune. The Hotrakas<sup>8</sup> with the Brahman sit down on seats of grass. Plants and trees having grown up bear fruit. So then if they mount all together on this day they mount on strength, on sap, on proper food. This serves to win sap<sup>9</sup> and proper food. Some say, 'Let him descend'<sup>10</sup> after saying *rasat*<sup>11</sup>. But this is not to be accepted. For the honour done to one that sees it not<sup>12</sup> = indeed not done. Others say, 'Let him descend after taking the food'. But this is not = be accepted. For the honour done to one that has approached near is indeed not done. Let him descend after seeing the food. For that = honour indeed which is done to one who sees it. Therefore only after seeing the food, let him descend. Let him descend towards the east, for in the east is born the seed<sup>13</sup> of the gods. Then let him descend towards the east.

<sup>7</sup> They, i.e. the Hotr and Udgatr. Max Müller follows R in translating 'he', but this makes nonsense and the commentary shows that R is wrong.

<sup>8</sup> They are the Hotr's assistants, viz. Pristatṛ, Brāhmanachakṣuṣan, Potr, Netṛ, Agnadhra, and Acchavaha. The division is not strictly accurate, as the second, third, and fifth are really classed with the Brahman and the Netṛ with the Adhvaryu but it corresponds to facts better than the later classifications, see Weber *Ind. Stud.*, X, 242 sq., Oldenberg, *Religion der Inder*, pp. 283 sq., Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literatur*, p. 97. *vrak* may perhaps be better spelt *brak*. Both the *v* or *b* and *r* present difficulties, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 284, 233. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 26. See Geiger, *Leitfaden der Sprache d. Singhalesen*, p. 28. The following sentence is quoted in the Naigeya Anukramani, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 373-374.

<sup>9</sup> Max Müller suggests that *iso* before *aryak* is expected. If it had occurred, it would have been quite natural, but it is not necessary to suspect the text as the reading above is *īsam eva tad i ryam annadyam* and the *eva tad* renders it less unnatural that *iso* should not occur. The phrase *eva tad* is very common in the Aitareya Brahmana, *tad* being of course adverbial. For the usual *ayadeten*, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 29.

<sup>10</sup> The descent does not of course come here in its proper order, but is inserted to complete the discussion of the topic of the movements of the priests.

<sup>11</sup> The reason for this being rejected is that it is only after the second *rasat* (the *annarasat*) that this *śakṣa* comes up, so that it could not see the priest on the way descending in its honour (*Sāyana*). For the word, cf. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 172. Foy, *Z D N C*, L, 229. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 34. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XI, 111, 269, for the form, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 2091.

<sup>12</sup> For the form *opatyate* cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 77. Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax* II, 529 sq., *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 240 sq. *Adhvryi-rya* appears clearly to come from *√ry* in the sense 'move' (cf. Greek *valutropos*). The separation into two roots (maintained in Bhattingh and Monier Williams' *Dict.*) seems quite needless (cf. Whitney, *Roots*, &c., p. 140), as *ryś*, *spears*, can easily be derived from *√ry* as *trans*. Cf. also Khilla, IV, 53 (ed. Schellertowitz).

<sup>13</sup> Max Müller suggests, and S apparently independently also suggests, that the reading may be *devourtaḥ samprajyate*. But the use of *samprajyate* = curious as the *am* has no intelligible force and on the other hand the form *retas* is not impossible, as forms from *a ar*, *ara*, exchange more or less freely throughout Sanskrit, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 415, 1319, and a long list in Wackernagel, op. cit. II i 113-114, in a *libharmi aquristas* i occurs in the *Śruti-pāṭha*, ibid., 111. In *Pa* of course the *ara* form prevails, Müller, *Pali Grammar*, p. 65. Cf. also Fickel, *Prakrit Grammar*, §§ 407 sq.

## ADHĪĀA 3.

They say, 'Let him begin this day' with saying the word *him*. In the word *him* = *brahman*, this day is *brahman*, and so he begins *brahman* by means of *brahman*,<sup>1</sup> who knows this. Now with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is masculine,<sup>2</sup> and the *re* feminine. They make a pair and so he makes a pair at the beginning of the hymn for the sake of offspring. Children and cattle are his who knows this. Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is *as* *brahman* like a wooden shovel.<sup>3</sup> Just as one desires to dig up anything with a wooden shovel, so with the word one digs up *brahman*. Whatever he desires, he digs up with the word *him*, who knows this. Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is the discrimination of divine and human speech.<sup>4</sup> So he, who begins with the utterance of the word *him*, discriminates divine and human speech.

<sup>1</sup> The time of *himṛtya* and *pratyadyata* are obviously really identical. This is readily explained by the originally timeless force of the form *ṛtya* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, II 889, 894). So the nonst participle in Greek sometimes coincides with the time of the verb, e.g. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 212. Dehnbach (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 405-409) holds that in all these cases the distinction of time between the main verb and the gerund exists, but, however natural the growth of this use is, it is only to be found in the examples by forcing the sense. Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 223) lays stress on the 'aoristic' effect of the weak root and appears to think that this accounts for the past force. But it should be noted that in Vedic we have no evidence that the forms were ever felt as other than participles either present or past. In *śiryaṃ dṛṣṭvā kṛtvā* it is most probable that the writer did not feel *dṛṣṭvā* as 'after having seen', but as 'seeing'. Cf. my remarks in *J R A S*, 1907 p. 164. For beginning the Mahārata with *him*, cf. Śaṅkhyana Aranyaka, II, 1. For *him* + *4/kr*, cf. Whitney, § 1079. It is obsolete in the classical language.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. I, 1, 3, 2, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. I, 2, 4. The use is found in the Antareya Brahmana, VI, 3, and often in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. For the idea, cf. the stories of the wedlock of the *siman* and *re* in the Śatapatha (IV, 6, 7, 11, etc.), and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, and Antareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 22, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Sayana explains this as a metaphor from the search of hidden treasure, a probable supposition in the case of India, where burial of treasure (cf. Gāṇḍhāra Dharma Sūtra X, 43-44, Vasuṣṭha Dharma Sūtra, IV, 23, 24, Manu, VIII, 34-39, Yājñavalkya, II, 24, 35) has always been frequent in consequence of the uncertainty of life and government. A different idea is found in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, 2, 5, 4, etc.

<sup>5</sup> That is, it distinguishes ordinary conversation from divine service. The Śaṅkhyana Aranyaka II, 1, gives different reasons for the importance of *him*. In Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, 1, 34, where the same distinction occurs, Sayana explains as Sanskrit and Apabhramśa (Eggeling, *S B E*, XLII, 200, n.), *dasya* must be correct *dasya* cannot well be adjectival, and the error in the MSS is trifling. Cf. III, 2, 5. It is noteworthy that later *dasya* is used for Sanskrit, cf. Dandin Kavyadarśa I, 33. *saṃskṛtasya mama dasya eva utakṣh* it: *maharṣidhik* Franke (*Life and Sanskrit*, p. 89) compares the fact that Mathura was called 'city of the gods' because of the Kṛṣṇa tale *dasyajñāna*, and is inclined to think that 'secondary' Sanskrit came to India from Kāśmīr via Mathura, a hypothesis which can hardly be regarded as probable.

2. They say, 'What is the beginning of this day?' Let him reply, 'Mind and speech'. All desires rest on the one, the other yields all desires. All desires rest on the mind,<sup>1</sup> for with the mind man conceives all desires. All desires rest on him who knows this. Speech yields all desires, for by speech man expresses all desires. Speech yields all desires to him who knows this. Then they say, 'One should not really begin the day with a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse, nor start from<sup>2</sup> a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse'. So one should say the *ṛgśruti* first. The *ṛgśruti* are *bhūh*, *bhuvah*, and *svah*,<sup>3</sup> and they are the three Vedas. *Bhūh* is the Rgveda, *bhuvah* the Yajurveda, and *svah* the Sāmaveda.<sup>4</sup> Therefore

The real meaning of the discrimination is suggested by Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 12, 13 *aniti vai dāvatī tatheti mātṛimā | dāvatā caṣṣamāṇāṁ saṁ mānuṣiṇāṁ ca pāpāṇāṁ evaṁ pramāṇāt*, cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 162, n. 1. The later use of *dāvatī* etc. must be related to Devanāgarī. For the question of Prakrit, cf. I, 5, 2, 3. In the *Āmāyaka* passage where Maṇu ponders as to addressing Śiṣṭi, the possibilities he contemplates are (according to Jacob) *evam mānuṣim saṁskṛtam*, or *dīpikā* i. e. *edam saṁskṛtam* which appears clearly to discriminate between the popular and sacerdotal forms of Sanskrit. That the former expression means (as Dr. Gerson, *Ind. Ant.*, LVIII, 56, holds) the Prakrit of the educated Kṣatriyas and well to do persons round the court appears exceedingly improbable. Nor is it correct to say that these forms of Sanskrit were practically alike. The Epic and the Sanskrit of the Brahminical schools are of distinctly different style, and Śiṣṭi might well have been surprised at being addressed not in the Kṣatriya fashion but by priestly expressions, much as a lady of the middle ages would find a great difference between the address of a countess and a monk, even when both spoke the same Latin language.

<sup>1</sup> Sayana explains this as referring to the seed for cere is going through the service, composed as it is of mixed verses.

<sup>2</sup> Sayana explains that the desires are phases of mind, *manovollāsaḥ* which is too subtle for the Āranyaka. Cf. Bhāṣāranyaka Upaniṣad, III, 2 *manasā hi kamanā kāmayaḥ*, and Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 292, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Max Müller following Sayana, takes the words *maro*—*synd* etc. as giving the ground for the rule referred to in *śādhur*. But this leaves no *iti* to mark the end of the rule referred to in *śādhur*, and in view of the usual practice of the Āranyaka, it is safer to take the quotation as extending to *synd*. There is no doubt that the construction of the last part of the sentence is not easy. For the abl., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 107 sq.; Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, 4, 51.

<sup>4</sup> For the later history of the triad see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upaniṣads*, p. 196, E. T., p. 217. See also Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 13, IV, 12, and I, 1. Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I, 5, 6, shows clear signs of a later origin than the Aitareya by its elaboration.

<sup>5</sup> On the three Vedas and the Atharvaveda, see especially Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, pp. 21 sq.; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 191 sq.; Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 22 sq. The silence of the Āranyaka is certainly in favour of its early date. It is of course true that the Atharvaveda contains much old material<sup>6</sup> and probable that a Samhita existed before the Āranyaka was written (cf. Taittiriya Samhita, VII, 5, 11, 2, where the Angirases are referred to

<sup>6</sup> I agree with Winternitz that Oldenberg's view (*Literatur des alten Indien*, p. 41) that prose magic formulae are older than 'poetic' which are imitations of the poetry of the hymns of the Rgveda is not probable.

he does not really begin the day with a *re, jānu, or saman* verse, nor start from *re, jānu, or saman* verse

3 He begins with *tad*<sup>1</sup> this. Now *tad*<sup>2</sup> *this* *this*<sup>3</sup> is food, and so thus he obtains food. Prajapati indeed uttered this *re* the first word consisting of one syllable or of two,<sup>4</sup> viz *tata* or *tata*. So *re* child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *tata* or *tata*. So with this very word with *tata* in it<sup>5</sup> he begins. A R<sup>6</sup> says (RV, X, 71, 1), 'O Bṛhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech. 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by speech are names made. 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless. 'That *re* hidden in secret by their love and yet *re* made manifest,' for this as regards the body *re* secret, merely the deities (who enter the body) but as regards the gods<sup>7</sup> it is made manifest. This is the meaning of the verse<sup>8</sup>.

(apparently as a fourth Samhitā), and Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 110), but the recognition is a sign of later date (Taittiriya Samhitā, VII, *re* not probably early, but, like VI, is later than the Anureya Brāhmaṇa).

<sup>1</sup> *Tad* is the first word of the first stanza of the first hymn of the Anureya Sastra the so-called *Rajana*, RV, X, 120, 1.

✓ <sup>2</sup> It may be rendered 'thus word *tad* (= *tat tad* *tad*), but Sāyana takes it as a repetition. The repetition of *annam* is apparently not connected with that of *tad* though it may have been helped by it.

✓ <sup>3</sup> Max Müller seems to regard the two alternatives as *tat* and *tata* or *tata*. This of course is the usual signification of *śaksara* and *dyaksara* but Sāyana refers these words to the quantity of the first and second syllables in *tata* and *tata* respectively. The form of the sentences makes this seem certainly correct however unusual it may be. *re* may have here early evidence of the omission of the final *a* in ordinary conversation.

<sup>4</sup> I take *tat* *tata* *tad* separately and *re* *tat* as = 'so'. This seems also to be Sāyana's interpretation. Max Müller says 'With this very word, consisting of *tat* or *tata* (cf. the reading of L) he begins,' and in a note 'If *tat* is called the very same word, *re* is used in the sense of *re*.' This appears rather unsatisfactory, and Sāyana is probably right in thinking *tat* and *tata* similar enough for the purpose here in view. This passage indeed, seems to be a deliberate and somewhat elaborate variant of the older legend (preserved in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 1, 6) by which Prajapati when he first spoke uttered *śākā bhṛgāh, and jānu*, which are words of one and two syllables respectively. Sāyana has *ekena āvartena* *śakābhṛgāh* *ī d adhyam āvartadīkṣābhṛgāh upetā dyaksara*. *śakābhṛgāh* is apparently an adject. *dyandya* with disjunctive force, cf. Wachsmann, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 70, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 23 sq., *1 ergi Syntax*, III, 224 sq. for early examples. The whole sense is little more than that *tad* which is equal to *tat(a)* or *tat a*) is the name which, as *brāhmaṇ*, is revealed in the deities and implicit in man in whose organs, &c., the deities are (as in II, 1, 3, Śukhāyana Āraṇyaka, IV, 1, &c.).

<sup>5</sup> For *adikāśaralam*, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 3, 1, &c., Whitney, *P A O S.* Oct., 1890, p. 18. So often in Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

<sup>6</sup> This stanza is very obscure. Sāyana quotes Āitreyiya Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 11, 8, where it is laid down that a child's secret name is only to be known by father and mother until the *upanayana*. That this is what is referred to here is not impossible, as Max Müller points out,

4 He begins with, 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1), for that = indeed the oldest in the worlds 'Whence sprung the terrible one with brilliant might,' for from it he was born who is terrible with brilliant might 'Immediately on birth he destroys his foes,' for immediately on being born he destroyed evil 'After whom all helpers rejoice,' for all creatures are helpers, and they rejoice after him, saying, 'He<sup>1</sup> has risen, he has risen' 'Growing by strength, the powerful one' (RV, X, 120, 2) for he grows by strength the powerful one 'As foe he smites fear into the Dāsa,' for all fear him 'Taking that which breathes and that which breathes not,' this refers to the living and the lifeless 'What was offered in the feasts came to thee,' this means, 'all is in thy power' 'All turn their thoughts on thee' (RV X, 120, 3), this means all beings, all minds, all thoughts, turn on thee 'When these two become three helpers,' these two being united produce offspring Children and cattle are his who knows this 'Join what is sweeter than sweet with the sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring sweet, and so with the pair he joins the offspring 'He<sup>2</sup> conquered by the sweet that which is sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring is sweet, and thus through the pair he conquers offspring. A Rv<sup>3</sup> says,

but the interpretation adopted in n 4 above seems to render the reference quite unnecessary } The last verse he explains as meaning that the form of the gods who enter the body is hidden from men but the gods themselves know the name well : This is practically meaningless, and Max Müller suggests that it may be that the name refers to the gods or to *śat* the *brahman*. The reference however, to the deities who enter the body is clearly meant in some form of II, 4 2, 1, 5 and the sense is the *brahman* = *śat* which is the beginning of speech and the first of names is revealed (as the gods) and implicit in man. This section is referred to by 'Sayana' on Atharvaveda XVIII, 4 77 see Lanman in Whitney's *Atharvaveda*, p 892

<sup>1</sup> The *īva* RV, X, 120, 1-3, which begins is a *śloka*, because it corresponds to the *Paṇḍita* Saman

<sup>2</sup> i.e. *brahman* (Sayana) The explanations of this hymn in the *Āranyaka* must be deliberately perverse so absurd are they Cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 221 n 6

<sup>3</sup> The double *śat* *śat* is, according to Sayana because he is *śatya* of heaven and Agni or earth. The exact use of the nominative is characteristic of the early character of the text, cf Whitney's criticism of Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.*, II 8-36, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 280-289) in *J P XIII*, 190, *Spec. per. I edische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 274

<sup>4</sup> Sayana takes *śat* as referring to *anukūṃsa* which is *śamodā* as consisting of the son and daughter in law. *Madhura* is equal to grandchildren, and *śakyaś* is 'provide', i.e. 'provide that dear pair with dear offspring, our grandchildren' He does not therefore even follow the *Āranyaka* which clearly took *śamodā* as accusative. Max Müller translates 'And this (the son when married) be as very sweet conquered through the sweet.' But this represents neither the *Āranyaka* nor Sayana.

<sup>5</sup> This verse which is not in the *Ṛgveda* is not by any means clearly connected with the rest. Sayana gives two alternatives that it is connected with the verse *śatish śatish śatish śatish śatish* : *śam*, or with the whole *Śastra* (not as in Max Müller, that it is connected with the hymn *śat śat śat*, or the *Veda* in general) In the first case 'this body' is the body of the sacrificer, the other

'Since he raised this body in that body,' he means this body consisting of the Veda in that corporeal body\* 'Then let this body' be the medicine of that,' he means this body consisting of the Veda is to be the medicine of that corporeal body. Of this eight<sup>2</sup> syllables are *gāyatrī*, eleven are *tristubh*, twelve *jagati*, and ten *viraj*. This consisting of ten syllables rests in the other three metres. The three syllable word *purusa*<sup>3</sup> goes into the *viraj*. These indeed are all metres, the three and the *viraj*. To him who knows this<sup>4</sup> thus in this day completed with all the metres.

5 He extends the verses by the use of *nada*<sup>1</sup>. *Nada* indeed is man. So a man speaking sounds as it were. In the words *nadam va oḍaṇam*<sup>2</sup> (RV, VIII, 69, 2), *oḍaṇaḥ* are the waters in heaven, for they water all this, and they are the waters of the mouth, for they water all proper food. In *nadam yoyutaniṁ*, *yoyutaniḥ* are the waters of the sky, for they inundate as it were, and they are the waters of perspiration,<sup>3</sup> for they run constantly as it were. In the words *patm vo agbhyānam*, *agbhyāḥ* are the waters that are born of the smoke of fire,<sup>4</sup> and they are the waters that spring from the organ. In *dhenūnam*

body the body of the parents and the result is seen in *śraddhā*, &c. The other case gives the interpretation of the Ananyaka, as Sayana himself admits, *śat etad doṣṭyaṁ vyākhyānam anyasīty adina brāhmanena śpaṣṭakṛyate*. This shows how little Sayana felt bound to follow his authorities. The words *svam-arrajata* occur in various guises in Atharvaveda, VII, 3, Taittiriya Samhita, I, 7, 12, 2, Maitrayani Samhita, I, 10, 3, Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, II, 19, 32, Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra III, 17, 1.

<sup>1</sup> The body of the sacrificer (Sayana)

<sup>2</sup> The hymn *śat id am* (Sayana)

<sup>3</sup> The hymn, RV, V, 120, is *tristubh*, and the desired metres are only obtained by torturing it. The first, second, and fourth *paḍas* have ten syllables the third eleven. The first eight of the first *paḍa* gave the *gāyatrī* the remaining two added to the ten of the second and fourth *paḍas* the *jagati*, and the first, second, and fourth (or rather the fourth), the *viraj*.

<sup>4</sup> Because by adding *pu* to the first *paḍa*, *ru* to the second, *sa* to the third, the verses all become *tristubh*. See V, 2, 6.

<sup>5</sup> In *svam and* (perhaps one word), cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 63. *śatata* may be genitive (cf. m. 8 on I, 2, 2) or dative.

<sup>6</sup> The exact meaning is explained in V, 2, 6. After each *paḍa* of RV, V, 120, 1 is inserted (besides the syllables *pu*, *ru*, *sa*) one *paḍa* of the hymn, RV, VIII, 69, 2, so as to make a *brhati*. Cf. Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, and Eggehaug, *S B A*, XLIII, 113, n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Sayana explains the verse with reference to juice produced at the third pressing of the Soma, the *ryita* (cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Aftsk.*, I, 135 sq.), and takes *nadam* as the sacrificer, and supplies *raṭata*. For the real sense see Fischel, *Vedische Studien* I, 191 sq.

<sup>8</sup> *śraddhā* is clearly correct, the accusative being cognate. *Rs śraddhā* is primarily attractive but is improbable, and as a perusal of p. 80 will show, he (like the MSS., cf. Whitney, *P A O S*, Oct., 1887, p. xiv) is very uncertain about nasals. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 275, Spenser, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 24, Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax* I, 366, 368.

<sup>9</sup> Sayana gives two interpretations, either smoke (in the shape of a cloud) produced by fire, or from smoke and fire, quoting *haladā*, Meghaduta, 4, *dāhmagyāṭīkhalīmanarūṣaṁ*



*rudhyasā*, the *dhenā-ah* are the waters, for they stir all this, and by *rudhyasā* he means 'thou art lord'.<sup>1</sup> He extends<sup>2</sup> a *tristubh* and an *anustubh*. For the *tristubh* is male, the *anustubh* female, and the two are a pair. So a man having taken to himself a wife regards himself as it were more complete. By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty five.<sup>3</sup> The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajapati is the twenty fifth. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth. He adorns this trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty five, and the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty five, like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty five.

6 He begins<sup>4</sup> with *taś*, this. Now 'this this' = food, and so thus he obtains food. Prajapati indeed uttered this as the first word consisting of one syllable or of two, viz. *tata* or *tata*. So a child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *tata* or *tata*. So with this very word with *tata* in it he begins. A Rv. says (RV, X, 71, 1), 'O Brhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech. 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by 'speech are names made'. 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless. 'That is hidden in secret by their love and yet is made manifest,' for this as regards the body is secret, namely the deities (who enter the body), but as regards the gods it is made manifest. This is the meaning of the verse.

7 He begins with the hymn, 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1). What is oldest is great, the form of this day as possessing greatness<sup>5</sup> is perfect. (There is the word 'greatness' in the verse, 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV, X, 54, 1), the form of this day as possessing greatness is perfect. (There is the word 'strength' in the verse, 'He groweth more for strength' (RV, VI, 30, 1), the form of this day as possessing strength is perfect.

*san nityāh āta nityāh*. The waters are *agnya*, he says, because plants and trees are to be tended by all. Cf. also Brhaddeśata IV, 41, which explains RV. I, 164, 43. *śatamayam dhāman* Atharvaveda, IV, 10, 25.

<sup>1</sup> 'Thou art food', in Max Muller's translation must be a slip. *patyan* is regular, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 1061, and is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in this form.

<sup>2</sup> *taś id ara* is in *tri tubh*, *madam na odātum an anu tubh*. The former is male because bigger than the latter. For the following cf. Levi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* p. 157.

<sup>3</sup> The twenty five are made up by nine verses of RV, I, 120, 1, six of X, 54. Five of I, 1, 30 and three of I, 51, 4 which are mentioned in I, 3, 7 below. Cf. I, 1, 2, 4 and 6 on I, 1, 1.

<sup>4</sup> This is a mere repetition of *khanda* 3 and the ascription of it here according to Sayana is for the glory of the whole hymn whereas the purpose of it as *khanda* 3 was to extol the word *taś*. This may be correct, but it is very obscure.

<sup>5</sup> The difference in the first two verses of course is that in the first *prishnor* needs to be equated to *madat*, whereas *madat* actually occurs in the second. For the construction, cf. I, 2, 1, n. 4.

(There is the word 'hymns') in the verse. 'Then, manbest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV, III, 51, 4), this day is indeed a hymn, and the form of this day as possessing a hymn is perfect. He extends the first two<sup>2</sup> verses, which are deficient, by a syllable. In the small<sup>3</sup> (womb) seed is deposited, in the small (heart) the vital spirit, in the small (stomach) food is placed. This serves for the obtainment of these desires. He obtains these desires who knows this. The two of ten syllables serve to obtain both kinds of proper food, that which is footed and that which is footless.<sup>4</sup> They become eighteen syllables apiece.<sup>5</sup> Of the ten, nine are the breaths,<sup>6</sup> one is the self. This is the perfection of the self. Eight syllables<sup>7</sup> remain in each. Who knows this obtains whatsoever<sup>8</sup> he desires.

8. He extends the verses by means of *nada*.<sup>1</sup> Now breath is sound. Therefore every breath, when it sounds, sounds loud as it were. The verse *nadam va odātām* (RV, VIII, 69, 2) is by its syllables<sup>2</sup> an *usukh*, but by III feet an *anustubh*. *Usukh* is life, *anustubh* speech. Thus he places speech and life in him. By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty-five. The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajāpati is the twenty-fifth. He has ten fingers, ten

<sup>2</sup> That is RV, X, 120, 1<sup>a</sup>, with ten syllables, and VIII, 69, 1<sup>a</sup>, with seven. He adds *pu* to them.

<sup>3</sup> Cf I, 1, 2 ad fin.

<sup>4</sup> i.e. animals and vegetables (Sāyana)

<sup>5</sup> i.e. ten syllables in RV, X, 120, 1<sup>a</sup>, the syllable *pu*, and seven in VIII, 69, 1<sup>a</sup>. Similarly with the other three *śodas*.

<sup>6</sup> (*śruti*) *chidraṇi* is the version of Sāyana and it is as probable as any other, though the word originally meant breath and only metaphorically is transferred to its use as describing the organs of sense. The nine 'orifices', seven in the head and two in the body, according to a Sṛuti (Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 9, 10; 6, 8, is the reference, I think) cited by Sāyana (*soṣṭa vai śrutyāṇaṁ prāṇaṁ deṇa ānāśāṇaṁ*), are referred to in the Āśhala Upaniṣad, V, 1 (where = all, however, there are eleven), Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, III, 18, Yogakṣhā Upaniṣad, 4, Yogatattva Upaniṣad, 16, and elsewhere. They are ears, eyes, mouth, nostrils and organs of evacuation, with the nasal when ten are counted, as in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad, and Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, II, 77 (*J A O S*, XV, 240), and *brahmavandhā* when eleven are counted. Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, II 243, II T, p. 265; *Sehling Upanishads*, p. 181, n. 1, and *nava vai śruti prāṇaṁ*, Sāṅkhya Ānanyaka, II, 2, which points to a different 16en, for which see I, 4, 1, n. 5, 5, 1, n. 6, 2, n. 13.

<sup>7</sup> That is, after deducting the ten from the eighteen.

<sup>8</sup> In his interesting note on relative clauses in the Veda, Edgren, *J A O S*, May, 1883, pp. 16-17, points out that unlike Greek, Ionic Sanskrit uses the aorist *ed* pronoun with the indic. This rule is not observed in the later Vedic literature, e.g. *Āśhalyāna Gṛhya Sūtra*, I, 3, 1. *atā āśhalya yatra kva ca kanyā syat*, &c.

<sup>1</sup> i.e. by the stanza, RV, VIII, 69, 2.

<sup>2</sup> It has four *śodas*, and is therefore like an *anustubh*, which of course it really is. But it has in the Samhitā form only twenty-seven syllables, or resolving the *y* in *agāyamaṁ* in *āśh* 3, twenty-eight, which is the number of syllables in an *usukh*, which, however, has three *śodas* (8+8+12) only.

toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth. He adorns this trunk, the twenty fifth. Further this *dyū* (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty-five. Thus = the twenty fifth with regard to the body. Now with regard to the deities. The eye, ear, mind, speech, and vital spirits, these five deities<sup>1</sup> have entered into this person, and he has entered into these five deities. He is then pervaded wholly in all his limbs up to his hair and nails. So all beings, down to ants, are born thus pervaded. A Rv says (RV, X, 114, 8), 'A thousandfold are these fifteen members,'<sup>2</sup> for five arises from ten. 'As large as heaven and earth, so large is it,' for the self is as large as heaven and earth. 'A thousand-fold are the thousand nights,'<sup>3</sup> thus does the poet please and magnify the members. 'As far as *brahman* extends so far does Vac,' wherever there is *brahman*, there is Vac,<sup>4</sup> wherever Vac, there is *brahman*, = what = meant. The first<sup>5</sup> of these hymns has nine verses, for nine are the breaths, and it serves to win them. The second has six verses, the seasons are 4x, and it serves to win them. The third has five verses, the *pañkti*<sup>6</sup> has five feet, and it is food, so it serves to win proper food. Then comes a tristich, there are three threefold worlds, and it serves to conquer them. These verses become *brāhātis*,<sup>7</sup> the

<sup>1</sup> Cf I, 3, 3 above II, 4 2

<sup>2</sup> 'Then' is taken by Max Muller as referring to the five deities, by Sayana = referring to the body in which *śrutas* is. But the latter view seems quite sound. The senses and *śrutas* are absolutely later connected. For *sangāh*, cf Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 3 3. For *ś* cf Speiser *Vedic and Sanskrit Syntax* § 83, f. 1 O S, \VIII, 131 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *śukla* Sayana translates *atīrāṇy aḥśas* and, as hymns will not do he must be approximately right. His view is that the fifteen are made up of the five above mentioned and the corresponding five elements (earth, water, fire, wind, and ether) forming the mother and father. But this = more than doubtful. For the ten the *ātman* comes with its five organs and a complete body.

<sup>4</sup> Because the senses are applied to a great variety of objects (Sayana).

<sup>5</sup> *Brāhman* is in all and wherever a name is given, it is there, cf I, 3, 3. Sayana quotes a Śruti Taittiriya Āranyaka III, 13 *satvanti rūpaṇi vaco'ya dharaḥ | namana brāhmadādan yad aṣṭi ||* For the very close connexion of *brahman* and Vac, see I, 1, 1, 2 8, Atharvaveda, IV, 20, Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, p. 83.

<sup>6</sup> RV, X 120 has nine verses. The repetition of *esam* = due, says Sayana, to the comparative nature of these hymns as used in the Śāstra, the first *esam* refers to the hymns as they stand in the Śāstra, the second to them alone as they stand in the Samhita. This is of course impossible. For the nine *śrutas*, see I 3 7, = 6. For the seasons, cf Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, pp. 373, 374, Oldenberg, *S B E*, \LXI 134.

<sup>7</sup> *annam ca pañctiśāmdanaḥ śākyat-ś kṛtvam pañctirūpaḥ āpāmatat va pañctirūpaḥ*, Sayana. For the tristich and the worlds, cf Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 3.

<sup>8</sup> The first *pañkti* of RV X, 120 1, has with *śa*, eleven syllables the first *śa* do of I V, \VIII, 69 1, seven verses, making eighteen. So two *śa* do give thirty six syllables or a *brāhātis*. The twenty three verses give forty six *brāhātis*, as each is extended similarly (Sayana).





are taken to be<sup>11</sup> the best food For *śīraj* is food, and food strength Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints

2 Now comes the right wing It is this world,<sup>1</sup> it is this Agni, it is speech, it is the Rathantara, it is Vasetha, it is a hundred<sup>2</sup> These are the six powers of it. The *sampāta* hymn series to win desires and for firmness The *pañkti* verse series for proper food Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints Then follows the left wing It is that world, it is that sun, it is mind,<sup>3</sup> it is the Brhat, it is Bharadvāja, it is a hundred<sup>4</sup> These are the six powers of it The *sampāta* hymn series to

*haprithala Samhitā* IV, 1. *Laksya upadityaś* and compares Greek *θεῶν ἐρδία, ἰδία* and Latin *indus, enus* Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I 98) still treats *davusans* as if it meant 'I will play', as taken by Geldner (*Steden 19 Lieder*, pp 158 sq.) It cannot be from *√du* 'burn', as suggested doubtfully in Whitney, *Roots* etc., p 75

<sup>10</sup> *samāṣṭhānamāś* is clearly the reading, from *√samh* (i.e. *śamha* for *śa-ṣṭha*) It occurs in the *Taittiriya Aranyaka* Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 954, Macdonell, *Peddie Grammar*, p 58, Wachernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 44

<sup>11</sup> *annatamam pratyacyante* is thus construed by Max Müller who says the adverbial form is vouched for by Panini, V 4, 11 The free use of comparatives and superlatives of this class is a sign of early style but in the earliest literature (RV and AV) the accusative neuter is preferred, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* §§ 1111 e, and 1119 Cf also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X 1, 2, 5 *atamam khyate* ibid., V, 4, 2, 10 *annatamam gopate* and Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p 194, *prataram eva khyante*, *Altareya Brāhmaṇa* III 48, 4 *te natatamam āmanam apakata*, *Altareya Brāhmaṇa*, IV, 22, 3 But none of these or similar cases seem to justify *annatamam*, and the sense given by Sayana as *pratyacyante* would equally be obtained by rendering 'they approximate towards (*pratyā + √ac*) (that which is most truly food' (fem., because *śīraj* is fem.) For such a use of *annatama* cf RV, II 41, 16 (*ambitaram naditama, devitama*), and many examples in Delbrück, l.c., p 193 and for the acc. cf *abhisat pratyante* with acc. I 1, 2, n 10 The acc. is governed by the preposition *śat* may be taken with *dutah* as equivalent to a finite verb which is not very probable, or with *pratyacyante*, as giving the explanation of 'the *śīraj* are *śīraj*'

<sup>1</sup> Agni is the guardian of this world and he is also *√ac*, II 4, 2 and *√ac* is Rathantara, III, 1, 6 (Sayana) while *√asi* has brought the Rathantara

<sup>2</sup> See V 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV VII 31 22 and 23 VII 3 7 and 8 (three each according to the reckoning of the *Aranyaka*) I 32 (25 vv), VII 18 1-18, VII, 19 (21 vv), 20 (20 vv), 23 (6 vv), 25-29 (26 vv), IV, 20 (21 vv), making 100 in all, and then the *pañkti*, I, 80, 1, IV, 20, 14 styled the *sampāta* hymn

<sup>3</sup> The moon is the deity of mind, but here the identity of sun and moon is meant, says Sayana, and *manas* is Bṛhat, and *Bharadvāja* made the Bṛhat

<sup>4</sup> See V, 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV, VI 46, 1 and 2 VII, 60, 7 and 8 (three each according to this reckoning), VI, 18 (25 vv), 23 (20 vv), 24 (20 vv), 25 (9 vv) 31-38 (40 vv), IV, 23 (21 vv), making 101 in all, and then the *pañkti* I 81, 1 The *sampāta* is IV, 23, of *Altareya Brāhmaṇa* IV, 30, 2 The *śafam* is not precisely accurate, but the inaccuracy is deliberate There are 100 in the right and 101 in the left, and the *pañkti* verse ad's one to each of them For the varying sizes of the wings see *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa*, I, 2, 6, 3

win desires and for firmness. The *janāti* verse serves for proper food. These two are deficient and excessive. The Brhad is male, the Rathantara is female. The excess is of the male, the deficiency of the female. Therefore are they deficient and excessive. Now by one feather is the left wing of the bird, the better and therefore the left wing is the better by one verse. Next comes the *sudadohas* verse. *Sudadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then follows the tail. This consists of twenty one *dupada* verses.<sup>2</sup> For twenty one are the backward feathers of the bird. Again of all *stomas* is the *ekarimā* the support, and the tail the support of all birds. He recites a twenty second verse. This is given the form of two supports.<sup>3</sup> So all birds support themselves on their tails and having supported themselves on their tails they fly up. For the tail is a support. He (the bird) is supported by two decades of *tray* verses. He again, the man is supported by these two *dupadar* the twenty first and twenty-second. That which forms the bird serves to obtain the desires of the man. That which forms the man serves for his prosperity, glory, proper food, and honour. Next comes the *sudadohas* verse, next an additional verse, next the *sudadohas* verse. The *sudadohas* is male, the additional verse female. Therefore he recites the *sudadohas* verse on either side of the additional verse. Therefore the seed of the two when effused obtains oneness with regard to the woman alone. So birth takes place in and from the woman. Therefore he recites the additional verse in that way.<sup>4</sup>

3 He recites the eighty *gajatra* tristichs.<sup>5</sup> The eighty *gajatra* tristichs are this world and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in this world may I obtain it, may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine.

<sup>2</sup> These verses RV. I. 257 (1 vv.) 172 (4 vv.) besides twelve from other Śākhās are given in V 2 3. Cf. Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa I 2 6, 4. *ekam idam pītam idam pītam idam pītam*.

<sup>3</sup> The feet Sayana says. The idea seems to be when there are twenty two verses, that twenty represent the feet of the bird and two those of the man. When twenty one is the tail that is in question. See also V 2 3.

<sup>4</sup> *atra* is rendered *asmim* or *ja* with *loke* in Sayana. It seems rather to refer to the position of the additional verse between the *sudadohas*. For *asā* is in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of Liech. *Ecce Aitr.* XI 281. *Speyer Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* § 88. *lo asā* (Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 1098) is possible and must be so taken if *asā* is a noun as given in Lohring and Monier Williams *Dict.* But it is simpler to take it and *prā* as adjectives. Cf. II 1 2. *prāhā* *lo* where *lo* is probably meant. Cf. *aparaśā* in Taittiriya Upaniṣad II, 8 (S. B. E., XI 61 n. 2). *Apārāśā* Jacob *Concordance* p. 262. For the *ekarimā* see Weber *Ind. Stud.* V 142 n. 3. XIII 113 n. 3. Bolling *J. A. O. S.* XXIII 321 sq.

<sup>5</sup> The three acts of *tristichs* are the food of the bird. They are set forth in detail in V, 2 3, 4, 5 respectively.

<sup>6</sup> Might is interpreted by Sayana as *vedāśāstrāpāya* *hi* *prā* and is opposed to *aparāśā* as *dharmādhyatma* *sagardhā* *prā* *prā* but he gives *prā* as an alternative rendering.

Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all this world. He recites the eighty *brāhṇī* tristichs. The eighty *brāhṇī* tristichs are the sky world, and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in the sky-world, may I obtain it, may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all the world. He recites the eighty *uśnā* tristichs. The eighty *uśnā* tristichs are that world, heaven,<sup>2</sup> and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in that world, and the divinity of the gods,<sup>4</sup> may I obtain it,<sup>5</sup> may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine.<sup>6</sup> Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all that world.

### ADHYĀYA 5

He recites the *śaśa*<sup>7</sup> hymn desiring all to be in his power. There are twenty-one<sup>8</sup> verses, for twenty-one are the parts in the stomach. Then the *śkarīmā* is the support of all *śtomas* and the stomach the support of proper foods. They are in different metres. For the intestines are larger one than the other,<sup>9</sup> some small,

<sup>2</sup> The insertion of *dyauḥ* is curious and Sayana notes it as being *vāpustartham*.

<sup>4</sup> This is taken by Sayana as being equal to *brāhman* the honoured of the gods, Indra, &c., and he quotes for it a passage intended to be Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, VI, 7 *saṁ tvaṁamāḥ paramam mahīvaranāṁ saṁ devanāṁ paramaṁ dātam* (so I, read with || *devatānam* (or *dāvatānam* with *ed*) *paramaṁ ca dāvatānam*). But, though Max Müller accepts this view, it is simpler to equate it merely to the divinity of the gods, i.e. the divine nature.

<sup>5</sup> Probably *agnānam* is suggested by the *af* of *afuts* equated to *af*, as stated by Eggeling (S. B. E., XLIII, 112, n. 1). The view that *afuts* contains the *af*, eat, probably led to the identification of the *afuts* with *anna* as throughout the Āraṇyaka and also || Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 5, 2, 17, but when Sayana in his commentary on this passage calls the *afuts* *annarūpāḥ* he merely refers, I think, to that identification and does not base it on etymology, as suggested by Eggeling.

<sup>6</sup> For the subjunctive as optative in sense, cf. Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 186 and for the question of subj. and opt., Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, App. I. For subjunctives in Antareya Brāhmaṇa see Aufrecht, pp. 429-430, and a full list in Lohitlank, *Chrestomathie*, pp. 349-350. See also Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 306 sq., *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 365 sq.

<sup>7</sup> In Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 11, the *sūdadohas* verse is repeated twenty-four times. It agrees in counting the *śaśa* hymn as referring to the *śtoma*. The hymn is RV, VIII, 46. See I, 2, 5. It is called '*śaśa*' in I, 5, 2 below. The name is given because the author is Śaśa (Śāśva) says Sayana and this is probably the case, showing the early date of the traditional authorship. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, and Eggeling S. B. E., XLIII, 112, n. 2. See also Oldenberg, Z. D. M. G., XI II, 213 sq.

<sup>8</sup> Only twenty of RV, VIII, 45, but the *sūdadohas* verse is counted in, see, however, || V, 2, 5 ad fin.

<sup>9</sup> *Iktūdrum* is rendered '*coiled*' by Max Müller. The rendering in the text is that of Sayana and is supported by the use of *īktūdrā sa hi paśuśāśa* in Antareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 1, 5.



some big. He recites them with the word *om* according to the metre and according to the manner of the occurrence.<sup>4</sup> For the intestines are as it were according to the manner of their occurrence, some shorter, some longer. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Having recited this verse twelve times,<sup>5</sup> he leaves off. Twelfefold are these breaths,<sup>6</sup> seven in the head, two in the breast, three below. There are they contained, there are they perfected. Therefore there<sup>7</sup> he leaves off. The hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV, VIII, 40), forms the two thighs which belong to Indra and Agni,<sup>8</sup> the two supports with broad bones. The

where see Sayana's explanation. For the compar., see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 195 sq. The *Ardaya* = *sthūla* according to Sayana. The metres of RV, VIII, 45, are very various in the eyes of the Anukramanī. For the form *antastya*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 124, c. The twenty transverse processes (*kuntapā*) in the abdominal portion of the spine (*udara*), Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XII, 2, 4, 12, 14 (Eggeling, *S. R. E.*, XLIV, 164, n. 1, Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 8, 10) suggest a different rendering, but the tradition is quite plausible. The epithet used too does not suit bones. ■ is, however, to be noted that in Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 6, the *anūka* which can mean the lumbar portion of the spine (RV, VI, 163, 2, cited by Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 917) as well as the thoracic portion (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 14 cited *ibid.*, 1907, p. 9) is said to have twenty-one *parvanī*, and certainly this is so strikingly parallel to the *udara* with its twenty *kuntapā* (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 12), since the twenty first may be the *anūka* itself, that it is possible that this passage should be ■ interpreted. But to do so would only be justified by the belief that these early medical statements rest, as Hoernle (*Osteology*, pp. 101-109) holds, on acquaintance with current medical views, an opinion I do not share for reasons given in *Z. D. M. G.*, LXII, 134 sq.

<sup>1</sup> *jathapapīyam* is a difficult phrase. Max Müller, following Śāyana, renders 'according to rule'. Śāyana explains this with reference to the technical rule, given by Alvalayana Śrauta Sūtra VI, 5, 11, 12, that *āstapāda* verses are to be recited with a pause in the middle and *om* at the end, while *ekapāda* verses are to have *om* prefixed and affixed. This is artificial and perhaps it only means (cf. Monier Williams' *Dict.*, s. v.) 'just as it may happen', which version suits the *antastya* better, and Sayana ends up with practically this version. *Chandaskīram* (for the Sandhi, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 340, Aufrecht *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* p. 430, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 71) refers of course to the different metres of the hymn. Cf. V, 2, 5, and note. For the gerund, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 995, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 403 sq., Spitzer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 224.

<sup>2</sup> That is once each ■ the verses representing the body, neck, head, vertebrae, right side, left side, tail, food in three sets of eighty *frutheṣu*, and the *vāsa* hymn. In the case of the tail there is a *sūdadohas* before and one after the additional verse, and so the number twelve is made up.

<sup>3</sup> The number twelve is clearly to suit the twelve repetitions of the *sūdadohas* verse. It is probably got by taking the seven openings in the head, 1, 2, 7, 8, and adding the two in the breast, and the *nābhī*, *śrīṣṭa* and *guda*. For other fanciful enumerations cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 255 sq., E. T., pp. 283 sq., and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa cited in note 6 on I, 3, 7.

<sup>4</sup> He does not use that verse in the 'high' verses.

<sup>5</sup> Indra and Agni are the strongest of gods and the thighs enable the bird to fly aloft (Śāyana). In Śākhayana these verses form part of what represents the tail in the Āitareya, but

verses have six feet\* for firmness. Man<sup>10</sup> has a double support, cattle have four feet. So he places the sacrificer with his double support among the four-footed cattle. The second verse has seven feet,<sup>11</sup> and he makes it into a *gāyatrī* and an *anustubh*. Now the *gāyatrī*<sup>12</sup> is *brahman*, the *anustubh* is *Vac*, and so he unites *Vac* and *brahman*. He recites<sup>13</sup> a *tristubh* at the end. The *tristubh* is strength and with strength he surrounds animals. Therefore animals<sup>14</sup> depend on strength for their rising and their going forth.

2 In the Niskevalya hymn addressed to Indra,<sup>1</sup> 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV, X, 50), he inserts a *nuṣṭ*.<sup>2</sup> For clearly thus does he place strength in himself. They are *tristubhs* and *jagats*.<sup>3</sup> They say, 'Why then does he insert a *nuṣṭ* among *tristubhs* and *jagats*?'<sup>4</sup> 'One metre only

in Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, they are referred to the wings, see Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 111, 112. See also V, 3, 1, n 1, above, p 37.

<sup>2</sup> They, except two and twelve, are in the so-called *mahepanti* metre. For the correct expression *nuṣṭ*, of the use of *nuṣṭ* for the thighs, Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp 206, 215, perhaps wrongly read for *nuṣṭ*. If *nuṣṭ* is read here, it means 'the thighs and knees are supports', cf. Vajasaneyi-Samhita, XVIII, 23, Āpastamba Śulba Sutra, XI, 2 and 3 (*Z D M G*, LVI, 362).

<sup>10</sup> Cf I, 1, 2, n 5.

<sup>11</sup> It consists of seven *pīṭas* of eight syllables and can be made into an *anustubh* preceded by a *gāyatrī*. According to Sayana, following Āvalayana, in the latter case there is a pause after the second *pāda*, and *am* after the third. In the former the *am* follows the fourth, and there is a pause after the second *pāda*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf I, 1, 1, n 8.

<sup>13</sup> Sayana holds this to refer to a special mode of recitation, by which after the first *pāda* there is a pause, and *am* follows the second, and so for the third and fourth, and which he calls *tristubhamaya*. This is from Āvalayana Śrauta Sutra, VI, 15 6, RV, VIII 40 12 is in *tristubh*.

<sup>14</sup> This must mean, as Sayana says, and as Max Müller takes it that animals obey a master. The last two accusatives are loosely connected as accusatives of point in which, such acc are more frequent in Greek and Latin (e.g. Tacitus *Ann*, I 27 *deserunt tribunal manus insistentes, causam discordiae et intus armorum*). In the Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 215) so *atras paramam tapa adityam udiktamam urdhvas tisthats*. Max Müller observes that *asthaya* would be expected but it is not necessary to suspect the text. For the compound, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brahmana I, 47 and 48. In *śatru parigraha* the acc is dependent on *śatru* so Anāreya Brāhmana, VIII, 28, 1, 2, *tam etah palica devatubh parimariyam* (correct Speyer, *I ed uke und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 88).

<sup>1</sup> Forming part of the thigh verses.

<sup>2</sup> Sayana says the *nuṣṭ* (cf. Bhādaranyaka Upaniṣad III, 9, 1, for a *śāntideva nuṣṭ*) is to come after the fourth verse and is to be *Indra dezah tamam pabatu* (*śāntideva* S), &c (Śākhayana Śrauta Sutra, VIII, 17, 1). 'In himself' he renders as 'in the bird in the shape of the Śastra'. It may mean 'in himself' only. For the *nuṣṭ* see Scheffelowitz, *Die Afrikanen der Agade*, pp 126sq. The *nuṣṭ* *janaka granthe* in R is unhappily, a myth, the reading (in R, S, &c) is *janaka*.

<sup>3</sup> The metre is irregular. According to the Anukramanī, one and seven are *jagats*, the rest *tristubh*. Sayana offers the alternative of the last two being *jagats*.

<sup>4</sup> The *prāṇ* has *tristubhs* at the midday pressing and so the deviation needs explanation. Note that the answer is repeated, and is not that of the Aranyaka itself, though it is adopted.

cannot support or fill the *ṃvid* of this day,' so he inserts the *ṃvid* among *tristubhs* and *jagatis*. Let him know that this day has three *ṃvids*.<sup>1</sup> The *ṛasa* hymn is a *ṃvid*, the *Valakhilyas* are a *ṃvid*, and the *ṃvid* is a *ṃvid*. So let him know that there are three *ṃvids* in this day. Then come the hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been put down' (RV, X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV, II, 12). In these is the verse, 'When the hopes of all are on food' (RV, X, 29, 4), and it serves to win proper food. Then comes an insertion. As many decades of verses<sup>2</sup> in *tristubh* and *jagati* addressed to Indra as they insert between these two hymns, after transforming them into *brhatis*, so many years do they live beyond the normal life.<sup>3</sup> By this insertion life is gained. Next he recites the *śajanya*<sup>4</sup> hymn that cattle may come to his offspring. Then he recites the *Tarkṣya*<sup>5</sup> hymn. *Tarkṣya* is welfare, and the hymn leads to welfare. Thus he procures welfare. He recites

<sup>1</sup> Sayana says the *ṃvid* here referred to above is the *mūḍhya ṃvid*, and the others are *auparishad*, and he assigns the use of several metres in the *śaṭa* and of *tristubhs* and *jagatis* in the *Valakhilyas* as the reason for their being styled *ṃvids*. The *Valakhilyas* occur in the *brhatis* *tristubhs* see V 2, 4. The *Valakhilyas* and *Nivids* are printed from the Kaimir MS by Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, 1906. See also Oldenberg, *Gott gel. Anz.*, 1907. Scheftelowitz (pp. 10 sq.) argues that the *Valakhilyas* are among the old *khilas* which were accepted by some schools (probably the Raskala and Mandukya) and not by others (*Śakalya*), who only included 'Nationalhymnen in their tradition'. Oldenberg (pp. 321-325) effectually—in my opinion—demolishes this argument and leaves the *khilas* what they have hitherto been considered, later additions to the Rgvedic tradition, though doubtless in themselves old. The *Valakhilyas* are mentioned by that name in *Kausitaki Brahmana*, XXV, 8, *Taittiriya Āranyaka*, I, 23, *Bhāṭṭarvāṇi Upaniṣad*, II, 3, &c. Cf. also Macdonell on *Brhaddevatā* VI 48, III 116. Max Müller, *Sacred Hymns*, pp. xxiii sq., who is, however, wrong in saying that they do not occur in any *khila* collection, *St. Petersburg Diet.*, VI 954.

<sup>2</sup> *Śajanya* renders *śatā nam* as 'taken from the ten thousand numbered *Śaṭpāṭ*', and Max Müller takes it as 'taken from the ten Mandalas'. Neither meaning appears certain. *śatā* elsewhere means a decade, *śatāṇa* refers to the *Śaṭpāṭ* and I think *śatāṇa* must mean decades. They are decades of *tristubhs* and *jagatis* turned into *brhatis*, and it may be noted that six *tristubhs* and two *jagatis* give ten *brhatis*. This may be the reference, or the reference may be to the fact that three *tristubhs* and seven *jagatis* give thirteen *brhatis*. Sayana contents himself with explaining that of three *tristubhs* and four *jagatis* nine *brhatis* can be made which does not seem to be of much help. V, 3, 2, appears to support the view here taken.

<sup>3</sup> That is, no doubt, one hundred years, V, 3, 1, and I, 2, 2, n 14. For *śatāṇa* with *abl*, cf. Speyer, *Vedic Sanskrit and Sanskrit-Syntax* §§ 53, 90, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 113, Liebh, *Fests. Beitr.*, XI 195.

<sup>4</sup> That is, RV, II, 12, called *śajanyam* in *Altareya Brahmana*, V, 2, 1. For *śajanya* cf. Speyer, I c, § 188; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 487; Delbrück, pp. 323 sq. The form is given by Whitney, *Roots, &c.*, p. 14, as only found in the *Sūtra* and *Epic*.

<sup>5</sup> RV, X, 178, addressed, says Sayana, to *Tarkṣya Garuda*, but cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 145. R reads *Tarkṣya* but the *Sarvaśukramani* and *Brhaddevatā* agree with the RV. Cf. *Kausitaki Brahmana*, XXV, 5, and III, 2, 6, n 5. For the form, cf. Wackernagel, *Alt indische Grammatik*, I, 223. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 43.

the *ekapada*<sup>10</sup> verse that he may at once be all and win all the metres<sup>11</sup> In the hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV, I, 11), there are additions<sup>12</sup> to the verses: Seven verses does he make additions to For seven are the breaths<sup>13</sup> in the head, and so does he place breaths in the head He makes no addition to the eighth The eighth is speech, and (he thinks), 'Let not speech be mingled with my breaths' Therefore speech, though it has the same abode as the breaths, is not mingled with them He recites the *virāj* verses<sup>14</sup> *Virāj* verses are food, and serve to win food He ends with the hymn of Vasistha,<sup>15</sup> that he may become Vasistha (He should end) with the perfect verse,<sup>16</sup> with the word 'great' in it, 'This praise to the great, the terrible, the bearer' (RV, VII, 24, 5) In the verse, 'Like a steed labouring at the yoke, he has taken his place' (RV, VII, 24, 5) the yoke is the end (of the car) This day is the end<sup>17</sup> Thus is (the verse) fit for the day (He should end) with the perfect verse, with the word 'praise' in it, 'O Indra, this praise celebrates thee' (RV, VII, 24, 5<sup>18</sup>) With regard to the verse, 'As heaven over

<sup>10</sup> Sayana gives it as *Indro vishvam virajati*, see V, 3, 1

<sup>11</sup> It is the last of the metres used

<sup>12</sup> The phrase occurs also in Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 12, and is further explained in V, 3, 1, where Śāyana is much more explicit than in his commentary here The idea is 1<sup>a</sup>, 1<sup>b</sup>, 1<sup>c</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>b</sup>, 2<sup>c</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup>, 3<sup>b</sup>, 3<sup>c</sup>, and so on The result is a curious intertwining *vyatirahga*, of verses A similar proceeding is found in Astareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 3 VI, 24 For other examples of this process, called *vikharana* also, cf Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 15, 4 (at the Āpyayana of the Madhyandina Savana), IX, 5, 4 (at the Sodāśin), XII, 11 5, and Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 2, 7 (śalākṣilyas, when a *vyatimarjam vikharana* takes place), Roth, *Z D M G*, XXVII, 109, who traces the practice even in the Rgveda, and Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p 103

<sup>13</sup> The openings are referred to above, I, 3, 7, 8 4 1, 4, 1 The eighth as Vāc refers no doubt to the tongue The first reference to seven openings is not (as Deussen seems to hold) that in Atharvaveda X, 8, 9, which is there practically unintelligible and which is given up by Whitney (*Translation* p 597) but which appears in a more plausible form in Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad, II, 2, 3, where the verse has as its last *pada* 'vag arāmaḥ brāhmaṇa samidāma', but that in AV, X, 2, 6, where the seven *dhāni* are given as eyes, nostrils, ears and mouth (see Whitney, *Translation*, p 568, Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907 ■ 12) In ver 7 the tongue is specially mentioned The seven, however, seem already to have included Vāc, to judge from the explanation in that Upaniṣad, II, 2, 4, where, according to Deussen's translation, it is intended to stand for the tongue, as indeed seems clear from its being connected with Atri and *aftri*, though Böhtlingk, in his translation, ■ 26, takes it otherwise Sayana here refers to the other *pranas* as *jihvatāṅgādibhiḥ* Vāc apparently then is little more than a duplicate Cf I, 3, 7, ■ 6 For the seven *pranas*, cf also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 5, 1, 8

<sup>14</sup> RV, VII, 22, 1-6, see V, 3 1

<sup>15</sup> RV, VII, 24 For the word *śīla* in ver 5, see Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 135

<sup>16</sup> The sixth verse is placed after the fourth and the fifth comes at the end, V, 3, 1

<sup>17</sup> The last day is the *śukrayanīśataraṭra* For *dīkṣ*, cf RV, II, 2, 1 *dīkṣiḥ idam* 'charnoiter', Hepburn, *J A O S*, XIII 257 sq

heaven," give us glory' (RV, VII, 24, 5<sup>d</sup>), wherever the speech of the Brahmin<sup>11</sup> is uttered, this is his glory, when he who knows ends with this verse. So let him who knows this end with this verse

<sup>11</sup> Śīyana renders, 'as in heaven so in the worlds (the *maharāṭa*, &c.) above the heaven!' The same *maharāṭa* is dropped in to explain II, 4, 1

<sup>12</sup> Śīyana vaguely says *zadasambandhi vakyam*. But I think there is a clear reference to the speech of the Brahmins. The opposition is probably  $\approx$  yet mainly to non Aryan tongues, cf. Tāndya Mahābrahmana, XVII, 1, 2, 9. Whatever be the history of Vedic and Sanskrit, it is difficult to believe at this date (800-700 B.C.) in very much development of Prakritic forms so as to render contrast with them natural though no doubt such forms existed. (Cf. the discussions in *J R A S.*, 1903, pp. 435 sq.) See also I, 3, 1, 5; III, 2, 5; Śatapatha Brahmana, III, 2, 1, 23 with Eggeling's note on the Hānva reading, Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 20-24; Leaman's notes on Whitney, *Atharvaveda*, III, 12, 4, X, 9, 23; XII, 4, 4; XIX, 8, 4; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I xvii. The Atharvan passages point to the possibility that some of the Prakritic forms are due to the later tradition and are no evidence for the time of the Atharva. Similar considerations are familiar in the Homeric question see especially Monto, *Odysey*, XIII-XXIV, Appendix, pp. 445-484. The early date of the Epic if adopted (cf. my notes, *J R A S.*, 1906, pp. 1 sq., 1907, pp. 681-683) would bear out the view that Prakrit was not so early as has been claimed (cf. Franke, *Fuhr und Sanskrit* (1902), pp. 49 sq.) the ruling speech of the people. No doubt the Mantra literature represents a poetic diction (cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 38 sq.) but it has not yet been made even plausible that contemporaneous with it were really Prakritic dialects, though no doubt in certain cases the tendencies which produced Prakrit were already in full force. The subsequent history is doubtless that of the more and more marked separation of the literary and the vulgar speech (cf. Delbrück's neat summary of the history, *Altindisches Verbum*, pp. 3 sq.) and the place of the Epic must (it seems to me) be found either before the decay of speech had rendered the Sanskrit unintelligible to the warrior classes of the populace—and the Epic appears in origin to have been precisely like the Homeric Epic (see Lang, *Hom. and His Age*, 1906) poetry composed by poets at the courts of princes who sang to the retainers and friends of their patron—not of course an epic of the lower classes or the mere cultivator, though he would understand it in part—or after the general revival of Sanskrit in the second and third centuries A.D. The latter view seems to raise more serious difficulties in our conception of the history of language and literature than  $\approx$  can pretend to solve. I still think the earliest epic (as distinguished from mere *dhyanas* or *stūtras*) must date from the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. and be contemporaneous with the Brahmanas and Aranyakas, though of course in the case of both Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana extensive additions have been made by priestly hands in the two or three centuries before the Christian era. Only thus can a real place be found for Pāṇini's *śāstra*, or for the customs of the Drama which must represent a real state of affairs when Sanskrit could be used by kings and nobles as intelligible to their inferiors. For what Kātyāyana spoke in the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. we have no evidence save the Brahmanas, where they speak Sanskrit, and the Epic, so far as we can regard it as contemporaneous. In view of the fact that Patañjali knew the Drama (*Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 456 sq.), it seems only reasonable to assign to his period the separate use of Sanskrit and Prakrit for the different characters and either then or earlier the state of affairs must have been real. Nor is it possible to accept the theory of Lévi, Barth, and Gerson (*Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 110) that an originally Prakrit drama was turned into Sanskrit. This theory leaves no plausible explanation open of the use of Prakrit for some characters, since *ex hypothesis* both men and women equally used Prakrit in conversation, and, while it is quite intelligible that after the drama was an

3 'We choose that of Savitr' (RV, V, 82, 1-3) and 'O god, Savitr, this day' (RV, V, 82, 4-6), are the *strophe* and *antistrophe* (of the Vaisvadeva hymn<sup>1</sup>) and are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial<sup>2</sup>. Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the Vaisvadeva)<sup>3</sup> is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (the Vaisvadeva) = their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest who knows this recites this Vaisvadeva. Then comes the Savitr hymn, 'Of Savitr, the god, this great and desirable thing' (RV, IV, 53). Great<sup>4</sup> is the end. This day is the end. So the verse fits this day. Then comes the Dyāvā-Prthivī hymn, 'Which is the elder, which the younger' (RV, I, 185), in which (the verses) end alike<sup>5</sup>. This day is one on which (the sacrificers) end alike. So the hymn fits the day. Then comes the Rbhu hymn, 'Born not for steeds nor reins, worthy of praise' (RV, IV, 36). With regard to the words, 'The chariot of three wheels,' the hymn is possessed of three (*trīṇa*), and what is possessed of three<sup>6</sup> is the end. This day is the end. So the hymn fits the day. The hymn, 'Of this benignant, greyhaired, priest' (RV, I, 164), addressed to

established fact it could remain popular long after it had ceased to be intelligible the popularity of a literary form *ex antio* unread is very strange. People in England would not go to Italian opera (which by the by is certainly understood by fifty per cent of the spectators), but for the fact that there was once and still is a popular drama in England.

Of course it cannot be contended—nor is it so claimed—that Sanskrit was ever the vernacular of the lower classes. What we have to conceive is rather a parallel series of languages diverging from vernaculars older than the Vedic of the earliest hymns, each current among certain portions of the people, but so their earlier stages intelligible to all. The Greek and English dialects gave a fair parallel, in both cases ending in a common form of educated and literary speech. Cf. Jacobi *Z D M G*, XLVIII 407 sq.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Sankhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 18, which differs in detail as usual. This section refers to the evening Soma pressing, when the Vaisvadeva and Āgṇimaruta Sāstras are recited, see Weber, *Ind Stud*, V, 353, 354 n 3, Eggeling *S B E* XLVI, 322, 361 (Vaisvadeva), 369 (Āgṇimaruta). Caland and Henry, *L'Agnistoma*, pp 354 sq.

<sup>2</sup> The *prakṛti* is here the Vāṣṭi, and the *mukhaprakṛti* is the Agnistoma, as usual.

<sup>3</sup> Cf I, 2, 1. Sayana selects the two tristichs as the immediate point of reference.

<sup>4</sup> Because greatness is the *me plus ultra* of all things (Sayana).

<sup>5</sup> *udakta* is equal to *anta* in the one case and to *sitarakṣi eva dhruva phalaṇi* in the other, according to Sāyana. The sacrificers obtain *brahman*, he adds, but this is hardly meant. Most of the verses end alike in this and the following cases. Cf. for the word, Atareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 1, 3, 12.

<sup>6</sup> This is not obvious. Sayana refers it to the case where two wheels are inadequate and a third is found necessary. This wheel, as before the *dīkṣ*, is the end, I, 5, 2. Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, pp viii, ix) points out that *trivakra* in the Samhitās is merely an epithet of the cars of the Athiras where its sense is mythological and he therefore denies the existence of three wheeled cars in the Vedic period, but cf. Weber, *I et al*, 1899, p 364 n 1.

the All gods, = multiform \* This day = multiform So the hymn fits the day (Of what he recites) the end<sup>a</sup> is, 'Forming the waters, the buffalo hath lowed' (RV, I, 164, 42) The hymn, 'May powers auspicious come to us on every side' (RV, I, 89) addressed to the All gods, is one containing an insertion, and is perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the hymn with the insertion<sup>b</sup>) = the atonement Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (insertion) as their rest He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest who knows this recites the hymn with the insertion The verses 'To Vaisvanara, who strengthens law, our praise' (RV, III, 2, 1 sq) are the strophe of the Āgṇimāruta Śāstra Praise is the end This day is the end So the hymn fits the day The hymn, 'The Maruts, rushing onward, with gleaming lances' (RV, V, 55) addressed to the Maruts, is one in which (the verses) end alike This day = one in which (the sacrificers) end alike So the hymn fits this day He recites, before the next hymn, the verse, 'To Jātavedas let us pour the Soma' (RV, I, 99 1) addressed to Jātavedas The Jātavedas verse is welfare and wins welfare So he makes this into welfare The hymn, 'To Jātavedas, who deserves our praise' (RV, I, 94)<sup>c</sup> addressed to Jātavedas, is one in which (the verses) end alike This day is one in which (the sacrificers) end alike So the hymn fits this day<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> It is of multifarious content as indeed is the case and is recognized in the Anuśramāṇa The day is multifarious because of its collection of Vedic mantras and popular elements like dancing

<sup>b</sup> That is only forty one verses are to be taken Cf V, 3 2

<sup>c</sup> The insertion = after the ninth verse, *visva devaḥ somasya mātān* (Scheffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda* p 137) &c.

<sup>d</sup> On RV, I 94 see Oldenberg, *S B E* XLVI 108 sq

<sup>e</sup> At the end Sayana observes that this ends the *karmakāṇḍa* of the Āraṇyaka The next two books are the *jñānakāṇḍa* or the Upaniṣad This regular opposition really of course means very little Both parts deal with *jñāna* and not with the performance of the rite, but the first Āraṇyaka does of course treat the rite in some detail, explaining its mystic significance, while the second Āraṇyaka diverges to speculations less closely associated with the actual Mantras of the ceremonial A more real opposition of *karma* and *jñāna* would be to oppose books V and I-III For the relation of *karma* and *jñāna* in Śāṅkara's view, see his commentary on Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I 22

In some MSS (see Crit Note) a summary of the chapters of each Āraṇyaka = given at the end For similar summaries, cf those of the Taittiriya Upaniṣad, Max Müller *S B E*, VI, xxviii, xxix, that in VIII, 3 of the Bauddhāyana Āraṇyaka and Hauskalt Upaniṣad, IV, 2

ARANYAKA II *vide p 40 (contin)*

## ADHYĀYA 1

THIS is the path, this<sup>1</sup> is the sacrifice, this is *brahman*; this is truth. Therefore let no man diverge<sup>2</sup> from it, let no man transgress it. For they did not transgress it; of old, those that did transgress it were overcome. A RṢI<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sayana, following, as throughout this part of his commentary, Śaṅkara (cf Śaṅkara on Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I, 12, translated by S. Sataśima, *Upanishads*, V, 112-113), discusses the relation of the *karmakāṇḍa* and the Upaniṣad. His conclusion is that it is that of *sādhana* and *sādhya* the sacrifices serving to purify the mind through the destruction of evil and the production of a desire for knowledge. He quotes and rejects the views (1) that knowledge is unnecessary, it being sufficient to give up all works good or evil, and to perform the various regular and occasional sacrifices, and to exhaust what one has begun by enjoying it, so that at death freedom is attained. He points out that it is not possible to abandon good and evil, such acts being endless, and that the sacrifices performed must bear fruits and the actions of previous births must produce many other births. (2) Others held that a union of knowledge and sacrifice is the cause of freedom. But knowledge is directly contradictory to sacrifice, since the latter involves the conception of the self as active, whereas the former recognizes that the self is *anurikha*. (3) Others hold that sacrifice is the ladder which beginning with the simplest and ending with the most complicated sacrificial rites leads to knowledge as the cause of freedom. Sayana points out life is too short for this. (4) Others think the *karmakāṇḍa* is used in a subsidiary manner, just as in catching cranes one throws cord on their heads and it muzzling blinds them, so one should sacrifice. The reply is that this is surplussage: one should catch one's crime straight off. The story is reminiscent of putting salt on the tail of a bird. (5) The use of sacrifice is to exhaust desire through the enjoyment of the desires produced by such acts but clearly it is replied, desire is not so quenched. Sayana also explains at length the *visaya*, *prayoga*, *adhikāra*, *prastāva* and *prayoga* of the system which he attributes to the Upaniṣad. Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 57 sq., L. T., pp. 61 sq. 'This' means both what is just past and what is to come, and so Śāyana refers the *etat karmā* to Aranyaka I, and *etat brahma* to Aranyaka II and III. The latter alone is true.

<sup>2</sup> Sayana thus discriminates the divergence as due to mere laxness: the transgression to interest in other matters, ploughing or industry, or such forms of devotion as relic worship &c. For *prā + śmad*, cf Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 5, I, 11 2, Kāthaka Upaniṣad, II, 5, which support my emendation *pramattam* in Śākhāyana Aranyaka, VII, 29.

<sup>3</sup> The verse is of course absurdly construed. It is impossible on any theory to make much sense of it. As taken in the translation, the idea is that three peoples were ruined the others settled round Agni, in the sense that with Agni as their helper one people has been prosperous, the others not. Compare the view of the Śatapatha Brahmana, I, 4, 1, 10-12, that no country is civilized until Agni burns over it, Eggeking, *S B E*, VII, 211 sq., Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 214, 215. The last two verses of the stanza of course are hopeless, save as indicating vaguely the connexion between Agni, the Sun, and Vayu. The Atharvaveda, X, 8, 3, has a different version, see Whitney, *Translation*, p. 596.



says (RV, VIII, 101, 14), 'Three peoples transgressed Others settled round the sun The great one stands in the middle of the worlds The blowing one enters the dawns' In the verse, 'Three peoples transgressed,' the three peoples which transgressed are the Vayases,<sup>4</sup> the Vangavagadhas, and the Cerapādas. In the

<sup>1</sup> Sayana and Ānandaurtha agree in taking this as referring to the fates which in another life befell the three peoples who transgressed. The peoples are Brahmanas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, and only one set was saved. The others suffer a *narakayāna* (cf for this idea Hopkins, *J R A S*, 1906, pp. 581 sq.), as birds, &c. Only they differ as to the meaning of the words *vayamsi vangavagadhāḥ* (*traṣṭāḥ*). Sayana renders them as birds, trees (*vanagaḥ śpṛśāḥ*), plants (*śvanti manuṣyādān and grdhyaṁte 'bhakṣyante*), and snakes (*uraḥpādāḥ tarṣāḥ*). Ānandaurtha prefers Phocas, Rākṣases (*vange* is from *vam jānam* and *gamyante*, and *magadha* from *grdhā abhaktakṣyam*), and Asuras. We are justified therefore in holding that there was no trustworthy tradition, and it is therefore possible to consider whether Max Müller's suggestion that the words are perhaps old ethnic names is correct. In its favour it may be noted that Sayana and Ānandaurtha compel us to assume that the Āranyaka accepts the fullest form of the doctrine of transmigration as a punishment (e.g. *kanitaka* Upaniṣad, I), which is a comparatively late view and which I do not think is found in this Upaniṣad. If they are ethnic names, then *Vayamsi* gives us a people like the Matsyas, Ajas, &c., in whose names we may, if we like, see totemism.<sup>5</sup> The *Vangavagadhāḥ* are a composite tribe or group of tribes like the Kuru Pāñcalas, whose name reminds us of the later Vanga (known to Mahābhāṣya (Weber *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 386) and to Mahābhārata, Dharmasūtras, &c. in conjunction with Aṅga), as part of what is now Bengal. The *Cerapādāḥ* are a third tribe, whose name points to the later Ceras of Southern India. It is of course possible (cf Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 31) to argue that these verses show a later date and a wider geographical knowledge than is compatible with the early pre-Buddhist date here attributed to the Āranyaka. But in this respect it may be observed that Rhys Davids (cf Bühler, *S B E*, II, xxv sq., *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, 246-248, Weber, *ibid.*, XX, 273; *Z D M G*, XLIX, 479) presses unduly the argument from the Buddhist texts. There is in addition in the grave doubts as to the age of the Buddhist texts the possibility that these texts show only the regions where Buddhism had penetrated and that there were Brahmanical countries beyond these limits (cf Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, 245 sq., Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 254 sq., *Mañjushūkā*, I, p. xv). It may be questioned whether Buddhism early gained a direct hold on much of Southern India, at least there is no evidence that it ever did. Besides the question arises whether the Cerapādās must have been settled in the South at this date. It should be noted that the text says they were destroyed, and this may refer to a disaster in the old tribe, a remnant of which wandered south and later appear as the Ceras, who are known in the south to Aśoka and to Kātyāyana, Weber, I c., p. 371. Bhandarkar, *History of Deccan*, p. 143.

The version of Sāvana takes *cerapādāḥ* as *ca urapādāḥ*. This seems very unlikely because a single *ca* with the second of three connected words is not elsewhere found in this Āranyaka, and is nowhere common (For examples cf RV, I 77, 2 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLII, 101) and Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 475.) It is, I think, much more likely that three names of defeated tribes should not appear in the precise forms here found elsewhere than that names of plants and beasts should so disappear. At any rate they must all three be plants and

<sup>4</sup> More animal names, *rywe* little as to totemism, which is not demonstrated for any Aryan stock, cf Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* IV, 116, 256, Macdonell, *Ind. Myth.*, p. 123. Hopkins, *P A O S*, 1894 p. cliv, Keith *J R A S*, 1907, pp. 929 sq., Bühler, *Ind. Stud.*, III, 48

verse, 'Others settled round the sun,'<sup>1</sup> these people are settled round Agni here, as the sun. In the verse, 'The great one stands in the middle of the worlds,' that great one in the middle of the worlds means this sun. In the verse, 'The blowing one enters the dawns,' the meaning is the purifying air enters the quarters.<sup>2</sup>

2 People<sup>3</sup> say, 'Hymn, hymn.'<sup>4</sup> The hymn is indeed the earth.<sup>5</sup> For from it all that exists springs. It praises Agni. Food are its eighty verses,<sup>6</sup> for by food one obtains all. The hymn = the sky. For (birds) fly along the sky, and along the sky men drive. It praises Vāyu. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The hymn is also yonder heaven. For by

animals or names of tribes. Monier Williams' *Dict* takes *vanga* as plants, *svagadha* and *cervapada* as names of peoples, which is quite impossible. Dr Schiefelowitz in his forthcoming *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* (which he has been so good as to show me in MS) considers that *vanga* is formed from *van* by the suffix *ga* (when *g = gu*). He compares *madgu* (not for \**mag* but from *√mad + ga*), *khadga*, *phalga*, *stargā*, *targa*, *phalgā*, *lunga*, *stnga*, *drdhaga*, *ulig*, *venig*, *sphig*, *dāga* (not = IG *g gū*) &c. But even if this is the case the origin of the word throws no light on its being used as a tribal name, nor do I feel sure of the equation *vanga* = tree. Possibly *va ga* *Magadhā* may be read, cf my *Saṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka*, p. 46 n. 4, Bauddhayana Dharma Sūtra, I, 2, 13 and 14.

The citation of the R̥gvedic verse in full is of course natural when an explanation is being given. So verses are cited and explained in full at II, 1, 6 (RV, I, 164. 31) II, 1, 8 (RV, I, 164. 38), II, 3, 1 (RV, IV, 27, 1) III, 1, 6 (RV, V, 114, 4) III, 2, 3 (RV, I, 113. 1). In the last case the verse is cited entire to indicate the sense desired to be understood. So also verses are cited in full in the Saṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka, VII, 15, 18, 20, VIII 4, 6, IX, 15, XII, 8. 35.

<sup>1</sup> Anandātīrtha, here and throughout interprets in a Vaiṣṇava sense. *arkam* is *Viṣṇu* *Āditya* is *Vṛṇu*, and *taishān* is *upastam cakra*. To Sayana, *arkam* is Agni *ahavaniya*.

<sup>2</sup> Sayana justifies this by *pratyadishah tattatkarmanu tatstish satyo nūthanaivaishalyam karanti*.

<sup>3</sup> Sayana explains, following the Mimamsa, III, 4, IV 1, III 3, that the purpose of Āraṇyaka, II 1. 3 is to enable men to attain concentration of thought by meditating on things connected with the sacrifice. There are five principles in such meditation: (1) The meditation falls on the lot not of the *gavariṇas* but of the *ritay*. (2) The meditation must be on the *pratīkas* of the hymns as deities like earth &c., and not vice versa. (3) If the *dhyāna* is prescribed for a certain thing only in one Śikha, it can nevertheless be taken over by another Śikha e.g. by the *haustakins*. (4) It is not obligatory in every case to go through all the forms of meditation which are prescribed in connexion with any part of the rite. It is sufficient to make the choice desired. (5) Nor is it necessary to adopt the meditation along with the sacrifice as an essential part. It is a matter of choice.

The last rule shows the manner in which the Brahmins avoided the open rejection of sacrifice and yet justified their own speculations as a practical substitute for sacrifice.

<sup>4</sup> That is, not knowing its secret reference. Sayana follows the Āraṇyaka in deriving *utkām* from *ut ti śakti*. Anandātīrtha, of course, explains the whole by the doctrine that *Viṣṇu* is omnipresent and so all things can be identified with him and through him with one another. Cf Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaśad, V, 13, 1 (where *utkāśpaya* is the derivation of *utkā*), *haustaki* Upaśad, III 3.

<sup>5</sup> The three acts of elicty *tistichā*, in *g yatra brāhmi*, and *manā* I, 2, 3, 4, 5.

its gift all that exists springs. It praises the sun. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. So much as regards the gods. Now as regards the self. The hymn is man. He is great and is Prajapati. Let him know that he is the hymn.<sup>4</sup> The hymn is his mouth, as in the case of the earth. It praises speech. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The hymn is the nostrils, as in the case of the sky. It praises breath. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The bend of the nose<sup>5</sup> as it were is the place of the brilliant one. The hymn is the forehead,<sup>6</sup> as in the case of the heaven. It praises the eye. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and with reference to the self, for by food all these beings breathe<sup>7</sup>, by food<sup>8</sup> he conquers this world and by food that world. Therefore the eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and to the self. The food and the feeder are the earth, for all that exists springs from it. Whatever goes forth, (heaven) consumes it all<sup>9</sup>. Whatever goes thence, the (earth) consumes it all. So earth is both food and feeder. He<sup>10</sup> becomes feeder and food. He is lord of nothing that he eats not, or that eats him not.

<sup>4</sup> Sayana points out that this contradicts the Mīmāṃsā, see *Brahma Sūtra*, IV, 1, 3, 4, but solves the contradiction by saying the first view rests on *nyayabalaḥ*, that here on *eo amo balat, him rva ās vacanam na kuryon waste varamayatsādhora etī ās īśtrokaranam dandmah* *Vidyā* it here means *dīkṣyati* once both knowledge and meditation are concerned with mind (*jñānādhyāsayor manatattatāmyena*).

<sup>5</sup> The reference is to the bend just below the brow where the nose springs out. Sayana cites the *Jabāla Upaniṣad* II *astamam vārya itthonam bhavati* | *śrutev prānasya ca yuḥ sandhāḥ* (see *bandhāḥ* R?) *sa eva dyāvuritāḥya parasya sandhīr bhavati* | This refers to *brahman*, so *Āditya*, who is *brahman*, is here an *upāṅka* of *brahman*. *Ānandaśrītha* takes *rva* as meaning *kimci* 'wh' while Sayana says it is equal to *eva* or has no meaning. Cf. I, 1, 2, III 2 6.

<sup>6</sup> *śiṣṭavarāṇītha* says *śaśaśābhīrva caktur grhyate*. The word, found in the *Aitharavedy*, V, 2, 8 properly denotes 'brow' or 'superciliary ridge'. See *Hoenle Outledge* pp. 222 sq, 227 sq.

<sup>7</sup> The *śruti* with the nasal is *uktīrthaprasiddhyartha* says Sayana. The next *pred* *sau nam* is noteworthy, see *Delbrück*, *1 ergl Syntax*, III, 247, 248.

<sup>8</sup> By giving food to retainers and by sacrifice respectively.

<sup>9</sup> Sayana and *Ānandaśrītha* take this as referring to the doctrine of transmigration. But this is hardly necessary. The earth consumes what the heaven sends, as e.g. rain, not persons who are born again, or as Sayana says, sacrificers who having enjoyed heaven after death return again to earth. It is not proved that such an idea is known to this *Āranyaka*. Cf. II 1, 1, n 4, 3, n 5, 3, 2, n 3, 7, 2, 5, 8, n 15, 4, 2, n 1, 5, on 6, 2, 9. For the use of *prerita* (for the form, cf. *Okenberg*, *S B E* XLVI 2, *Banholomae*, *Iran. Grundr*, I 54, 70) as *prerita* Sayana has reference to the analogy of *pra + √a*. The form of the *śruti* is that laid down in *Parāśi* VIII, 2, 107, cf. *Wackernagel Altindische Grammatik*, I, 298 sq.

✓ <sup>10</sup> This is very obscure. There seems little doubt, however, that it is intended as the expression of a vague pantheism. Cf. Emerson's 'I am the doubter and the doubt. And I the hymn the Brahmin sings.' The priest identifies himself with the hymn and also with Prajapati (see above), and so becomes as Max Müller says subject and object in one.

3. Then comes<sup>1</sup> the origin of seed. The seed of Prajāpati are the gods.\* The seed of the gods is rain. The seed of rain is herbs. The seed of herbs is food. The seed of food is seed. The seed of seed is creatures. The seed of creatures is the heart.<sup>2</sup> The seed of the heart is the mind.<sup>3</sup> The seed of the mind is speech. The seed of speech = action.<sup>4</sup> The act done is this

Ānandatiltha interprets it that Viṣṇu consumes all worlds, and all beings enjoy him, which is the same idea attached to the name of Viṣṇu. Śaṅkara contrasts the *uśīṣaka* and the *anūśīṣaka* and explains the matter slightly differently in the last sentence as meaning that other men do not enjoy him (*yad rā-jasmāc ca kāraṇat*). He reconciles this with the fact that he is *adyaś* because that refers to *śratmaśhūtasaraśhlegajalarūpaṇi*. This explanation = not probable, but undoubtedly the construction of the last words contains a serious difficulty = *yad* cannot correspond to *adyaś*. The fact perhaps is that *yad* is used for formal correspondence with the previous *yad* though it is not quite parallel in construction. It must be taken literally as an accusative of point in which—'or in so much as they do not consume him'. For the metaphor of Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 2: *anadyamāno yad adantam atis*; Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 2: *adyate 'tā ca dhātanti*; III, 7, 9, &c.; Śaṅkara Brāhmaṇa, X, 6, 2; XII, 9, 1; Maitrāyaṇi Samhitā, I, 10, 13; Kausitaki Brāhmaṇa, XI, 3; A. S. P., XX, 426, and the Puruṣa Sūkti. Another possible explanation, however, is suggested by Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 3: *sa (satyam as devatā) ha tasya neta yad enam aparidhat*, 'She is not able to drive him away,' where *yad* is a conjunction. So here the exact sense may be, 'He cannot help eating them and their eating him'; *tasya* being used to introduce the dependent clause. Cf. II, 1, 5, n. 5. No doubt originally *yad* was a relative, but the pronominal quality is clearly minimal in such cases. The opt. in such a case is one of consequences or characteristic, cf. *brāhmaṇam kuryān ya palyet*, III, 2, 3, n. 3. So I would explain Rāmāyaṇa, III, 19, 7: *na hi palyāny aham iṣte ya kuryān mama upayam*, which Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 371) explains (see § 195, 4) as merely indefinite. But the sense is slightly different from = mere indefinite. So Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 2, 23: *ad tā tād drśyam asti idā 'nyād tīkṣhām yā pīyati*, *Ibid.*, 24-30, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Śaṅkara says this section is intended to explain the greatness of *puruṣa*, mentioned in II, 1, 2. Ānandatiltha, on II, 1, 2, much more correctly says: *vidyāntaratān na puruṣakhandenīya sametāḥ (uttarātrasy etad anusandhīyam)*. Cf. Pischel, *Veilsche Studien*, I, 83 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Śaṅkara says that the element of *satva* is represented in the gods, of *raja* in men, and of *tamas* in animals, &c., and this explains the high position here given to the gods. This doctrine is of course later, appearing first most clearly in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 226 sq.; E. T., pp. 230 sq.; Garbe (*Simhāyastotra-kannuḍi*, p. 591) has conclusively, 'I think, dispersed the assumption counteracted by Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, IV, 11), Muir (*Texts*, V, 309), and Whitney (*Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 601) that Atharvaveda, A, 8, 43 refers to the *gunas*, see Lamm, *ibid.*, p. 1043.

<sup>3</sup> Because the *śivātman* is here, says Śaṅkara. Cf. Deussen, *op. cit.*, p. 259; E. T., p. 257.

<sup>4</sup> Ānandatiltha distinguishes *Aradya* and *manas* as being *śambhūti* and *anāpāraṇam* and *ekāśi* and *śamā* respectively. Śaṅkara's explanation is much more probable that *manas* denotes the knowing part of the heart, a frequent early use of the word, cf. Deussen, *op. cit.*, pp. 243 sq.; E. T., pp. 250 sq.

<sup>5</sup> Śaṅkara renders speech as the Veda, and action as sacrifice. Ānandatiltha evidently takes it as equal to *adentam kuryā rā*. He also (unlike Śaṅkara) constructs *karmakṛtam* as one word, *karmakṛtismam*. Ānandatiltha points in the text *karmakṛtam* against the commentary. Śaṅkara of course explains *Aradya* as done in a former birth, but this again is an unnecessary intro-

man, the abode of *brahman*. He consists of food \* and because he consists of food, he consists of gold. He becomes golden<sup>1</sup> in yonder world, he is seen as golden for all mortals, who know this.

<sup>1</sup> 4 *Brahman*<sup>2</sup> entered into that man by the tips of his feet. Because *brahman* entered that man by the tips of his feet, so men call them the tips of the feet (*prapadāla prapode*), but in the case of other animals hoofs and claws. Then he crept higher up, and they became the thighs. Then he said, 'Swallow<sup>3</sup> widely,' and that became the stomach. Then he said, 'Make it wide for me,' and that became the chest. The Śākarākṣyas<sup>4</sup> mediate on the stomach as *brahman*, the Ārunis on the heart. These two are indeed *brahman*. But he crept upwards still, and arrived at the head. Because he arrived at the head (*afṛaya*) then it became the head (*siras*). So the head is the head. These delights settled in the head, sight, hearing, mind, speech, breath. Delights settle on him who

duction of the transmigration theory, see II, 1, 2, 4, 2, 9 and Anandātīrtha does not accept it. The passage only means that action is the man, the man is what he does, a perfectly plausible view. For the relation of speech and action see Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 33, 4, II, 3, 8, III, 33, 9, Mahanarayana Upaniṣad, IV, 7, Oertel *J A O S*, XVI, 231.

<sup>2</sup> Anandātīrtha renders *sa* as *bhāgatan* and *iramayā* as *ichamuruparubhāgurnah* and *īranmayā* as *īdhyānandatīkṣmasubhāgurnah*. Sayana quotes Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 1, 1 *sa va esa furuṣa annarasaṁmayā*. He explains that as man is composed of food so he is gold in the shape of the egg of Brahman. Really the thing is a mere play on words. For the form *īran*(3) *mayā*, cf. Bloomfield, *P A O S*, April, 1893 p. xxxv, *A J P*, X, 11, 418, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 279. Also, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 38.

<sup>3</sup> Anandātīrtha explains *Narayanam janaḥ karmajam rūpam utīrjya nyānandaśītrupale bhavati*. Sayana says he appears as golden as the sun for the benefit of all creatures. Really it means, he appears (darśite passive of Delbrück *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 264, 29) to all creatures no doubt originally as the sun. The passage is like all this part of the Āranyaka II, 1-3, pantheistic. In Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa X, 1, 4, 9, the Agni is promised birth in the other world as *īranmayā*, rendered by Sayana *īranjāmanamocarnah* see Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII 295, 8, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Sayana explains that this chapter shows *prana*, the *śūdrā* of Brahman, entering the subtle body. His entry into the gross body is seen on II, 2, 2. He compares Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 6, 1. Maṭṭrayāniya Upaniṣad II. For *prapad*: Lanman in Whitney *Translation of Atharvaveda*, II, 33, 5 suggests *toe* as the meaning, but the dual renders that impossible here, and I believe in all the passages cited at p. xxviii the sense 'front part of the foot' as opposed to 'heel' is correct.

<sup>5</sup> Make a large hole, says Sayana. Max Müller's 'grasp' is a slip. The form is overlooked in the *Dict* and in Whitney's *Notes*, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Śākarākṣyaḥ is rendered *sakṣmasāstrīyāḥ* by Anandātīrtha, who, however, calls the *Arūṇayā* Rūṣ. He explains *śūdrām* as locative in sense as does Sayana, tacitly. The Śākarākṣyas are a subdivision of the Hāndrayas according to the Caranayāna and are mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya, IV, 1, 74, 75. Max Müller points out that neither in Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 11, 25, 27 nor in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa X, 6, 1, do these views appear—at least in terms. *Arūṇayā* appears also in Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa II, 5, 1 wrongly amended by Oertel to *Arūṇayā*, against the MSS. *brahman* may be meant but the next is more likely Cf. Weber, *Ind Stud* XVIII 140, v. Schroeder *Ind Lit*, p. 91, n. 3. That the heart (*Arūṇayā*) is *brahman* was the view of Vaidika Śākhya see Yājñavalkya's exposition in Bhāṭṭaranyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 7. See also Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 12, 4, VIII 2, 3 *Ind Stud*, II 177.

knows thus why the head is the head They strove together,\* saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn' They said, 'Come, let us leave this body, then that one of us at whose departure the body falls, will be the hymn' Speech went forth, yet (the body) remained, speechless, eating and drinking Sight went forth, yet (the body) remained, sightless, eating and drinking Hearing went forth, yet (the body) remained, without hearing, eating and drinking Mind went forth, yet (the body) remained, blinking as it were,\* eating and drinking. Breath went forth, when breath went out, (the body) fell It was decayed. (Because men) said it had decayed, it became the body Therefore in the body the body Who knows this, his enemy, the evil one, who hates him decays, the enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated They strove together, saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn' They said, 'Come, let us again enter this body, then that one of us, on whose entrance the body rises, will be the hymn' Speech entered, (the body) lay still Sight entered, (the body) lay still Hearing entered, (the body) lay still Mind entered, (the body) lay still Breath entered, (the body) arose, and (breath) became the hymn Therefore breath only is the hymn Let men know that breath is the hymn The gods\* said to breath, 'Thou art the hymn, thou art all this, we are thine, thou art ours' A Rsi says (RV, VIII, 98, 32), 'Thou art ours, we are thine'

\* There are similar passages in Bhādarāyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 2, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 1, Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad II 12-14, III, 2, Prāśna Upaniṣad, II, 1. The comparative antiquity of the versions must be open to doubt. But this version certainly seems simpler and more original than those of the Bhādarāyaka, Chāndogya, or Kauṣītaki Upaniṣads, which seem to embellish the theme with further details. The account in the Prāśna Upaniṣad is simple, but as that Upaniṣad is on other grounds late, that may be explained as merely a reference to a well known theme, and indicates the danger of arguments from comparative simplicity. For *hanta* with subj., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 23-43, Aufrecht *Altareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 430.

\* The masculine, *mūṣa*, is explained by Sayana as referring to *deśa* understood. It is probable that the idea in the mind of the writer throughout was *puruṣa* as the subject, hence the masculines as long as *puruṣa* remains in the *śāstra*. *śāstra* is Brāhmaṇa style first. Cf. Bhādarāyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 11 and 12 (2, 22 and 3 in the Madhyandina text) where *brāhma* is followed by *sa*. On the other hand in Bhādarāyaka, IV, 3, 22, the *hanta* text, after a series of masculines, produces *anantagataṃ puruṣaṃ*, and Śaṅkara explains *rupaparivṛtan naṣṭamāhātugam*. The Madhyandina version (as in Weber and Böhtlingk) has the masc., but as Max Müller (*S B E*, XV, 169) points out, Nivedaganga had *anantagataṃ* as he says *anantagataṃ ite rūpavṛtayo naṣṭamāhātugam*. There are also difficulties in the genders in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, III, 7, see Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 245, n. 4. In Śaṅkharāya Ṇṛanyaka, VII, 22, *hamarūṣa* and *hamarāṣa*, according to one MS, agree with *brāhma*. Such uses are not rare in Latin and Greek, e.g. *phle rīstov*, *Vergil Syntax*, III, 244. For its 3 *ā*, cf. *Altareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 22, 2, against Böhtlingk, *Sachs Ber*, 1890, p. 170.

\* The gods are those presiding over the parts of the body, see II, 1, 5, n. 3. For Prāśna as *brāhma*, cf. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 1, 2, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, IV, 10, 5, Taittirīya Upaniṣad, III, 3, 1, Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 33, 2. It was held by Uśanka Śaṅkharāya (Bhādarāyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2) and is refuted, ibid., V, 13, 1, Oertel, *J A O S*, XVI, 230.

5 The gods carried him forward<sup>1</sup>. Being carried forward he was stretched out (Because men say) he has been carried forward, the morning came into being. (Because men say) he has gone to rest, the evening came into being. Day is breathing forth,<sup>2</sup> night is breathing down. Speech is fire,<sup>3</sup> sight yonder sun, mind the moon, hearing the quarters, this is the union<sup>4</sup> of those sent forth. These deities are such in the body, but they openly appear among the deities, this is the meaning. This indeed said Hiranyadant Vaidā who knew this, 'Whatever they give me not,<sup>5</sup> I own not myself. I know the union of those sent forth in the body which they enter. This it is.' To him who

<sup>1</sup> Sayana explains that this section treats of *prāṇa* under various forms. Ānandabīṭha at times equates *prāṇa* and *vāyu*. The section is composed of bad etymologies. The first alludes to *pra + √ni* (*pra anayanta*).

<sup>2</sup> For the meanings of *prāṇa* and *apāṇa* see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 249-251, E.T., pp. 276-279. The oldest view is that they mean expiration and inspiration respectively, whence *apāṇa* comes to refer to the wind of digestion. Cf. I, 3, 7, 4, 1, II, 3, 3.

<sup>3</sup> This idea originates with the Purusa Sūtra, RV, X, 90, 13, 14, see Deussen, *Allgemeine Einführung*, p. 157, and later it develops into a regular system of gods who correspond to and guard the several psychic faculties. Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 241, E.T., p. 267. It is developed most in II, 4, 1, 2, where Agni, &c., becomes speech, &c., and enter man, while here they are merely considered as the several parts of the body. Cf. also I, 3, 3, Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, X and XI, *Laogan, Hindu Pantheism*, p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> The idea seems clearly to be that these four are gathered together in the body, and exist openly as deities as Sayana says. But *prākṛit* is very difficult and the whole seems an explanation of what was even then obscure. Cf. the varying versions of *puruṣa apravartī, anṛtaḥ satyaḥ clannan* &c., cited in Deussen op. cit. p. 20, E.T., p. 20, n. 3.

<sup>5</sup> This authority occurs also in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III, 6. Is his name a reference to gold stoppings in his teeth? They were known to the XII Tables (n. c. 450?) and to very early Egypt. *jam* is read by Rajendralala and in the Ānandasrama edition and also by Sayana. But it seems obvious that it stands for *jan* written before *m* carelessly as *annava*, cf. Max Müller, *Arari Hymns*, p. 12, II, 3, 3 n. 2, III, 1, 4, n. 3, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 62, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 313. To Sayana *jam* presents no difficulty as he merely supplies *padarthāḥ abhī jam*. The word *dadyuk* is difficult because the plural is unexpected after *ī* if that is a third person, when the sense would be 'nobody owns what the deities give not to me'. This is rather awkward but not impossible. The rendering of II, 1, 1 suggested in n. 10 there would give in this passage (though *jam* would still remain properly a pronoun), 'He owns nothing that they will not give me also,' which by an easy process of development would slide over into the sense, 'He cannot help them giving me (it),' showing the origin of such a developed construction as that in II, 1, 2. This comes to an assertion of the fact that all that the cosmic *puruṣa* has (he must be the subject of *ī*), that has man. It is simpler to neglect the commentators and take *ī* as first person, thus asserting the intimate union of man and the deities. In this use *jaṁ* is used with consecutive force, cf. the Mantra use of *ya* as final with subj. or opt. (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 321, 341), and the classical use (Speyer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 466). The absence of such a use in the Brāhmaṇas (cf. Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 279 c) is improbable. *ī* as a third person belongs to a type which occurs in all Brāhmaṇas, and is not a mere imitation of Mantra forms (as held by Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 419, where see other examples), see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 613. The form *prākṛit* presents great

knows this all creatures unconstrained pay homage That is *satya* (truth)  
 For *sat* is breath, *ta* is food, *yam* is yonder sun That is threefold Threefold  
 as it were is the eye, white, dark, and the pupil Even though he speaks  
 falsely, yet speaks he truth who thus knows why truth is *satya*

6 Speech = his rope, names the knots<sup>1</sup> So by his speech as rope, and by  
 names as knots, all this is bound For all this is names, and by his speech  
 he names everything. Men<sup>2</sup> bound with ropes carry him who knows this His  
 hairs are the *utukh*, his skin the *gajakri*, his flesh the *tristubh*, his sinews the  
*anustubh*, his bones the *jagati*, his marrow the *pankti*, his breath<sup>3</sup> the *brhasi*  
 He is covered with the metres Since he is covered with the metres, therefore  
 they call them metres (coverings) Thus the metres cover him from ilhap<sup>4</sup> in

difficulty To take it as Vedic for *prahistanam* as Sayana does is to introduce a very rare  
 form (cf Whitney, l c, p 114) into the text on the other hand the word *prahit* has no parallel  
 (save conceivably in form (*Ind Stud.*, III, 225) in *prahitah sampejant* in the *Ariseya Brahmana*, if  
 we may take that as dual form gen. and not as in Monier Williams' *Dict* as a gen. of *prahitu*) at any  
 rate in sense Whitney (*Roots* etc., p 102) gives *hit* as a form from *h*: I think that *prahit* should  
 probably be taken as the 'impeller', i.e. the desires cause the organs to work, cf. II, 4, 1, and 2

✓ The *t* of *ta* is to enable it to be pronounced (Sayana). Chandogya Upanisad, VIII, 3,  
 5 gives a different version, from *sat + ta + yam*, as the binding of the immortal and the  
 mortal (*ta* being the dual of *ti*) Cf Deussen cited in n 4 above Taittiriya Upanisad, II, 6,  
 derives *sat tyam* from *sat* 'manifest', and *tyat* 'not manifest' Bhadaraṇyaka Upanisad V,  
 5, 1, gives *sat + tyat* (so Śaṅkara (as here) but *haṅga* text, *ti*) + *am* when *sa* and *am* are = true,  
 and *t* (*ti*) = untrue (for *t* occurs in *anrita* and *arityu*) Kausitaki Upanisad, I, 6, gives,  
*sat* (what is other than the gods and the senses) + *tyam* (the gods and the senses)

<sup>1</sup> Cf Jaiminiya Brahmana, I 254 (*tanuikā*), Satapatha Brahmana, XII, 8, 2, 25, *A J P.*  
 XVII 400, elsewhere *purusa* is the third member, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 26 1, 34,  
 1 and Oertel's note

✓ This doctrine undoubtedly shows the moral disadvantages of the doctrine of salvation by  
 knowledge, and it is the precursor of the later immunity from moral censure of the *upanivṛtta*  
 Cf Kausitaki Upanisad III 1 Śaṅkara Vedāntasūtra, 23, *subhastubhoyor and utinyam*  
 and Jacob's note in his *Translation*, Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* pp. 164 167 In *anya* the  
 genitive is presumably possessive cf Delbück *Allindische Syntax* § 153, Franke *Be Beitr.*  
 XVI, 112, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* §§ 69 92, n, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*,  
 § 396 b Compare *etam me satyam* with *ta nāhī bruhā* (Introd., p 57), *J A O S.*, XLV,  
 116 117 For the position of *Z D M G.*, LXII, 129

<sup>2</sup> Sayana explains the metaphor from a rope for tying up cattle Ānandavijaya explains  
 as usual by identifying all with Viṣṇu His refers to *prana* of course

<sup>3</sup> Like oxen who carry men.

<sup>4</sup> *prana* here refers to the air or the subtle sense, and has not the wider sense of *prāṇa*  
 (Sayana), perhaps it = *Aranya*, as in II, 3, 7, and often, cf my *Saṅkhyāyana Aranyaka*, p 21

<sup>5</sup> This must be the sense Sayana however appears to render it whatever evil he desires  
 to do, the metres keep him from contact with it The connexion of *śāśad* and *chāśad* is very  
 doubtful, see I 1, 3 n 6, Leumann, *Et Hist.*, p 103

<sup>6</sup> See also RV, IV, 2 3 and 11 *marutam*, VI, 47, 16 *manuṣya*, Oldenberg, *S B F.*,  
 XVI, 319, Pischel, *Indische Studien*, I, 44 Bartholomae, *Studien*, I, 48



whatever quarter he desires who knows thus why metres are called metres. A Rsi says (RV, I, 164, 13), 'I saw the guardian,' for he is a guardian, for he guards all this 'Never tiring,' for he never rests 'Coming and going on his ways,' for he comes and goes on his ways 'Illuminating' the principal and intermediate,' for he illuminates these quarters only, the principal and intermediate: 'He moves up and down in the worlds,' for he moves up and down in the worlds. Then there is the verse' (RV, I, 55, 8), 'Covered' like caves by the makers' For all this is covered by breath. This ether is supported by breath as *brhati*, and one should know that, even as this ether is covered by breath as *brhati*, so all things including ants are covered by breath as *brhati*.

7. Now come the powers of this person. By his speech are created earth and fire. On the earth plants grow; fire ripens them. 'Take this, take this,' thus saying do these two, earth and fire, serve their parent, speech. As far as the earth extends, as far as fire extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of earth and fire decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of speech. By breath the sky and the air are created. People follow the sky, and hear along the sky, and the air bears

\* The verse, says Sayana. He explains that *prāna* is the guardian by referring to Kaustika Upaniṣad III, 2 *gotad(hy)aimiā rātre prāno vāseṭa tavaś ayur*. This passage of the Rgveda later served as the authority for the activity of *prāna* even in *śaṅkṣa*, Prāna Upaniṣad, IV, 3, Deussen *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 268, L. T. p. 297. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 17, takes the *prāna* and the suna rays as meant.

\* The four quarters and the four intermediate quarters SE, SW, NE, and NW. For the number of the quarters, at first four, later ten, cf. Hophins, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 283. *Prāna*, Sayana explains, is internally what *Āditya* is externally, see Prāna Upaniṣad, I 3, III, 8 *a liṅga ha tas bāhyā prāna udāyate*. In the original and in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad l.c., *astā* means 'wears'.

\* Not RV, I, 55 III (Max Müller following Rādhakṛṣṇa), nor I, 56, 8 (Ānandārama series).

\* Ānandātīrtha and Śāyana both cite and explain quite differently, the whole verse, but they agree in taking the caves as holes for concealing wealth. Cf. I, 3, 1, n. 4.

\* Ānandātīrtha renders, 'beginning with ants'.

\* In the nose, i.e. the power of smell (Śāyana). The use of the mass *ispīṣan* with a mass and a neut. and of *ispīṣ* below do not entirely agree with the rules of concord later accepted. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 88) gives only one doubtful example (RV, I, 8, 10) and Speyer (*Pedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 101) thinks that in classical Sanskrit with names of things the neuter is a more common predicate if the genders differ and one is neuter. This is laid down in a Vārtika (not in the *Āṣṭika* Vṛtti, it appears) on Pāṇini, I, 2, 72, which runs *tyadaditah heta pūmanpūmasakato hūgurananī | sō ca Devadattā ca tam | tō ca Devadattā ca | Jayādattā ca tam | tō ca Devadattā ca ||* So the neuter appears in Mahābhārata III, 58, 10, VI G 26, Rāmāyana VI 62, 37. If only persons are concerned the mass is regular, e.g. Mahābhārata, VII, 1, 29 *Pinḍavā ca mahatmāna Draupadī ca yajñavalkī | kṛtva anīḥ Anurāya prajāyāt prānukhī tatā ||* Raghuvamśa III, 23 *tatā nṛpaḥ sō na sutena Māgadhī nanandātīr tadāśrīṇa tatsaman, &c.* That this is old is indicated by the rule in Homeric Greek, thus formulated by Monro (*Homeric Grammar*, p. 157), 'Where an adjective

pure scent<sup>2</sup> Thus do sky and air serve their parent, breath As far as the sky extends, as far as air extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of sky and air decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of breath By his eye are created the heaven and the sun Heaven gives him rain and proper food, the sun causes his light to shine. Thus do heaven and sun serve their parent, the eye As far as the heaven extends, as far as the sun extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of heaven and sun decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the eye By his ear were created the quarters and the moon From the quarters they come unto him, from the quarters he hears, the moon produces for him the bright and the dark halves for good deeds<sup>3</sup> Thus the quarters and the moon<sup>4</sup> serve their parent, the ear. As

refers to more than one noun, it follows the most prominent or (if this is at all doubtful) the masc is used of persons the neut of things e.g., II 11 136 —

ὅτι ἐκ τούτων ἡμετέροις τὸ θεῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
ἦσαν ἐπὶ μεγάλῃ κοινότητι.

because the wives are chiefly thought of, but Od XII, 434 —

ἀμφὶ δὲ μὲν βασιὸν ἄλλο κῆρον βόλῳ φῶν χιτῶνα,  
βουγαλῶν βοσκήματα

The neut plur is especially used of sheep and cattle II 11, 244 —

πρὸς δὲ τῶνδε βοῶν δόμῳ, ταῦτα δὲ χυλὰ θέσται,  
αἵ γὰρ ἀμὲν καὶ οὗτοι

The first example shows that a fem can prevail over a neut in the case of persons, the second that in regard to things the neut prevails over the masc, the third that in regard to things the neut may be used of masc and fem animals Here *ausarationis* is a deity and so naturally the masc prevails cf Mann, VIII, 86, where *Ardayam* is personified In Latin the rule is (Allen and Greenough, *Latin Grammar*, p 273), generally, a predicative adjective will be masculine, if nouns of different genders mean *living beings* neuter, *if things without life* as Livy II, 40 *uxor deinde ac liberi amplius*, but Livy 4, 4 *labor voluptasque societate quadam inter se naturalis sunt iuncta* Even if masc nouns and fem occur, the neut. can be used if one of the subjects is a thing, e.g., Livy 31, 24 *natura humana sunt libera ciuitas et rex*, or even if two fem nouns represent things, e.g. Cicero, *de Fin* III, 18 *stultitia et temeritas et inuidia sunt fugienda* The basis of discrimination, therefore, is rather between living creatures especially persons, and things (which include sometimes the animals)

The use of the dual and plural of the verb is regular, cf Delbrück, pp 83 sq; Speyer, 1 c, though as in Greek and Latin and Anglo-Saxon the nearest subject may determine the verb, as is usual in the Bhaddevata. Cf ibid., VII, 74 for a set of mixed genders with a neut plur., VIII, 47, for a masc plur with a masc sing., a fem sing., and a masc dual, which follow Cf Delbrück, *Vergl Syntax*, III, 241-247, which this supplements

<sup>2</sup> Sayana refers to Bhādarāmyāla Upaniṣad, I, 3, and Chandogya Upaniṣad, I, 2, for the reasons, interference by Asuras, for the existence of bad smells, cf Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp. 99 sq. Ānandavīrtha takes 'him' throughout as meaning Varuṇ.

<sup>3</sup> Probably it refers to sacrificial acts

<sup>4</sup> Sayana admits the apparent inconsistency of this and II, 4, 1 where the moon is derived from the mind, but explains it away that the creation here is merely an imaginary one for

far as the quarters extend, as far as the moon extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the quarters and the moon decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the ear. By his mind were created the waters and Varuna. The waters yield to him faith for good deeds and Varuna preserves his offspring by his law. Thus the waters and Varuna serve their parent, mind. As far as the waters extend, as far as Varuna extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the waters and Varuna decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of mind.

8 Was it water? Was it water? This world was water. This was the root, that the shoot. This the father, those the sons. Whatever there is of the son's that is the father's, whatever of the father's, that is the son's. So it is said. Mahidasa Aitareya<sup>1</sup> who knew this said, 'I know myself as reaching to the gods, and the gods as reaching to me'. For hence are they gifted, hence are they supported. This is the hiding-place<sup>2</sup> eye, ear, mind, speech and breath. They call it the hiding place of *brahman*. He who knows this throws down the enemy, the evil one, who hates him. The enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated. He is the life, the breath, being,<sup>3</sup> and not being. The gods adored him as being, and so became great. So in sleep a man breathes *bhur bhuh*. The demons adored him as not being, and so were overthrown.<sup>4</sup> He becomes great by himself who knows this. The enemy, the evil one, who

purposes of worship, a *yajñ* *vacanam* as opposed to a *yajñavantu* creation. Such inconsistencies are not very important, but this small point adds to the evidence against II, 1-3 and II, 4-6 being by one hand. For Varuna, cf Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* pp 152 sq.

✓<sup>1</sup> Ahanda<sup>2</sup> treats of *gṛama* as the efficient cause, this Ahanda of him as the material cause. *Ap* is to be considered as an expression of the five elements according to Śāyana an unnecessary idea. The *pluti* indicates a quest on. The cause and effect are naturally identified. Ananda tirtha identifies them in *Viṣṇu*. The Garbha Upaniṣad I, traces the five elements in the human body, but the idea is not necessarily contained here.

✓<sup>3</sup> This mention is enough to prove that Mahidasa did not write the Āranyaka. But it is quite probable that he was the redactor of the Brahmana in its form of forty chapters. The saying here may no doubt be regarded as one of his Upaniṣads in the sense of secret teachings. Cf. Intro., p. 16. For the form, cf. Leumann *Gurupitṛakāṇḍī*, p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Rā endralala's commentary is wrongly printed. *śeḍa* is an error for *veda* and *omaḥ* is resolved wrongly. The end of the sentence explains the dependence of duties on men for devotion.

<sup>4</sup> It is called *gṛi*, because *gṛama* is swallowed up and hidden by the other senses. Cf. the doctrine that the senses enter in sleep into the *gṛama*. The *gṛama* forms thus the basis of the senses. Probably the idea of the Āranyaka is something like this and the translation 'mountain' misleading. For *śloṣ* cf. Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* p. 38, n. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Because the presence of *gṛama* secures the *śrīman* (Śāyana).

<sup>2</sup> Śāyana solves the difficulty of the evil effects of *śaktis* by discriminating between the desire of *śakti* for oneself as shown in the ruin of the demons and for one's for

hates him, is overcome. He is death and immortality. A R̥ṣi says (RV., I, 164, 38), 'Down and up he goes, grasped' by food,' for this up-breathing restrained by down-breathing does not go forth. 'The immortal dwells with the mortal,' for through him all this dwells together. For these bodies are mortal, the deity immortal. 'These two even go in different directions, they increase the one, but not the other,' for they increase the bodies, but the deity is immortal. He who knows this becomes immortal in yonder world and is seen as immortal by all beings<sup>4</sup>.

### ADHYĀYA 2.

He who shines approached this world<sup>1</sup> in the shape of man. For he is the breath. So he approached it. For he who shines is the breath. For a hundred years he approached it. Therefore a hundred are the years of the life of man.

<sup>1</sup> Ānandātīrtha renders *madhayaṁ* by *Vīṣṇu*. 'Sāyana takes it more properly as referring to digestion. The end of the verse means, according to Sāyana, that men nourish the body by food and drink, but not the *prāṇa*. Ānandātīrtha renders, 'at death they see the bodies deserted by Vāyu.' The epithet *śakṣantī* can only be justified by the fact that one of the two is immortal, and on the principle *chaitrino guchantī*. For more or less analogous cases, cf. *māsa*, *dhantī* (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, II, 102), and *śapāh*, RV., I, 70, 7, as interpreted by Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 70. On the same *chaitrinyaya* Govinda on Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 8, 10, explains why the Drauga Śastra is the Mahāvṛata according to that school is called Vāmadeva's though less than a half of it is by him (Friedländer, p. 32, n. 1). Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 113) quotes *dvādaśau māsaṁ* from Taittiriya Saṁhitā, VII, 2, 2, 1; Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā, XXXIII, 1; Paṭicavarga Brāhmaṇa, IV, 1, 2; *śikṣan dvādaśau*, Kāṭhaka, XXXIII, 3, and similar cases from Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IV, 5, 7, 2, XI, 6, 3, 5; XIV, 6, 9, 5; XII, 3, 2, 2; Paṭicavarga Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 5 (cf. *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 18). *Vīṣṇuṁ* is explained as having diverse functions, the breath moving the bodily senses, the body supporting the *prāṇendriyas*. *Vīṣṇuṁ* is referred to the fact that on death the body remains on the ground, while *prāṇa* seeks another world. Cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 374 sq.; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 221; Bohlingk, *Sachs. Ber.*, 1893, p. 92; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 536, n. 1, II, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Sāyana explains 'immortal' as united with *Hiranyagarbha*; Ānandātīrtha says 'emancipated.' But that this Āraṇyaka knows emancipation, instead of immortality, as the highest end is not even probable. *Dadṛe* (II, 1, 8) and *meme* (III, 1, 1) are both clearly present passives in sense. The original sense of the perfect was not distinguished from the present in point of time but denotes a state, cf. Gilks, *Comp. Phil.*, § 549. Moore, *Homeric Grammar*, pp. 31, 32; Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, II, 192 sq.; *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 221 sq.; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 297; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 823. The oldest sense is quite frequent in the R̥gveda. In cases like *śakṣiṣya* (I, 3, 4) and *dādhāra* (I, 5, 2) the naturally intensive form of the perfect is further strengthened.

<sup>3</sup> This Khanda shows that the names of the acers of the R̥gveda can be deduced from *prāṇa*'s actions. Ānandātīrtha explains the section as proving that Vīṣṇu is superior to all the gods. He takes *śakṣyāra* as 'he entered into', *brahman* and the other gods. He justifies his theory by quoting the Yāc Śūkta, RV., X, 125, as proving that Yāc, i.e. *Asurī*, is superior to the gods, and she of course is inferior to Vīṣṇu.

The sun and *prāṇa* are as usual identified, the one being the *adhyātman*, the other the *adhibhūtan* representation. The former attracts the vision, the latter impels the body.

Because he approached him for one hundred years, therefore they are the Śātarcins<sup>2</sup>. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Śātarcins. He placed himself in the middle of all that is. Because he placed himself in the middle of all that is therefore they are the Madhyamas. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Madhyamas. As up-breathing he is the swallower, as down breathing delight. Because as up breathing he is the swallower, as down breathing delight, therefore he is Grtsamada. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Grtsamada. All whatsoever was his friend. Because all whatsoever was his friend, therefore he is Visvamitra. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Visvamitra. The gods spake to him, 'Let him be dear to all of us'. Because the gods spake to him 'Let him be dear to all of us,' therefore he is Vamadeva. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Vamadeva. He protected all this from evil. Because he protected all this from evil, therefore they are the Atris. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Atris.

2 He also is a bearer of offspring. Offspring is *vidya*,<sup>3</sup> and he supports offspring. Because he supports offspring, therefore he is Bharadvāja. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Bharadvāja. The gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest' of us all. Because the gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest of us all,' therefore he is Vasiṣṭha. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Vasiṣṭha. He went forth<sup>4</sup> to all this whatsoever. Because he went forth to all this whatsoever, therefore they are the Pragāthas. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Pragāthas. He purified all this whatsoever. Because he purified all this whatsoever, then they are the Pavamānis<sup>5</sup>. Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Pavamānis. He said, 'Let me be everything small and great'. They became the Kṣudrasūktas and Mahāsūktas<sup>6</sup>. Therefore

<sup>2</sup> Really, Max Müller points out the name refers to their composing about 100 verses each. They are the seers of RV, 1. The Madhyamas are the seers of Books II-IV, Grtsamada of II, Visvamitra of III, Vamadeva of IV, the Atris of V. For the rest see Ahanda 2. The Madhyamas appear in *śaṣṭi* Brāhmaṇa, XII, 3. Āivalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, III 4 2, Śākhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra IV, 10, 3. Bhāradvāja, III, 116 (Madhyamāḥ), Sarvaṇukramanī, Introd. II to 4c. For the pkr, *Atrayāḥ*, cf. Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XLII, 226, n 1.

<sup>3</sup> *vidya* is taken as either the body from the *√yā* in the sense of going, or as food by *Śiṣya*.

<sup>4</sup> *Śiṣya* translates 'causing to dwell by his entry into us', and Ānandalītha has 'best of dwellers'. The ordinary sense seems preferable. Cf. II 2, 4 n 5.

<sup>5</sup> This seems to be the sense and is so taken by *Śiṣya*. Ānandalītha takes it either as 'he obtained' or 'he sang'. *Śiṣya* says the verses are called *Avagīṭhā* and also the poets. Probably the poets, of Book V III, are meant. Bharadvāja and Vasiṣṭha correspond to Books VI and VII respectively. The same lists appear in Āivalayana Gṛhya Sūtra III, 4 2, and Śākhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra IV, 10 3.

<sup>6</sup> Presumably the poets of Book IV are so described. Cf. *Āreya Brāhmaṇa* (ed. Burnell), p. 41, *J. Asiatic Studies* III, 99. In Āivalayana *parameśvār* and in Śākhāyana *paramānā* occur.

<sup>7</sup> The poets of Book V are referred to. Perhaps also the hymns were called *kṣudrasūktāḥ* as Max Müller suggests, but this is not certain. The last *kṣudrasūktāḥ* no doubt implies

they are the Kṣudrasūktas. 'Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Kṣudrasūktas. (He said), 'Ye have said what = well said.' These became a hymn<sup>4</sup> Therefore there is a hymn. Therefore men call him who is (*prāṇa*) hymn. He is a verse, for he went to<sup>5</sup> all beings. Because he went to all these beings, therefore he is a verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) = verse. He is also a half-verse, for he went to all these places.<sup>6</sup> Because he went to all these places, therefore he is a half-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a half-verse. He = a quarter-verse,<sup>7</sup> for he has entered all these beings. Because he has entered all these beings, he is a quarter-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a quarter-verse. He is a syllable, for he pours forth gifts to all these beings and because none can pour forth<sup>8</sup> gifts beyond him. Because he pours forth gifts for all these beings, and because none can pour forth gifts beyond him, therefore he is a syllable. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a syllable. Therefore one should know that all these verses, all these Vedas, all sounds<sup>9</sup> are one word, *prāṇa*, and that *prāṇa* is all the verses.<sup>10</sup>

*mahānīti*. See besides Āivalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, Bṛhaddevatā, III, 116, Sarvaśaṅkṣamāṇī, Intro., II, 10, with Macdonell's note.

<sup>4</sup> The poet is also called Sūkta, says Sāyana, but there is no authority for this.

<sup>5</sup> The construction is obscure, but the rendering 'he went' seems best. The dat. is natural, cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 44, Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, April, 1891, p. clxiv, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 886 b. Ānandātīrtha renders 'he went'. Sāyana's version is *svaprasavlena pujitam akarat*, taking *bhūtebhyaḥ* as *sarvabhūtebhyaḥ dehām*, and Max Müller renders, 'he did honour to'. He also adds that the poet is called R̥c as well as the Mantra. Cf. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 95.

<sup>6</sup> *Arāṇa* is taken as 'place' (cf. *arṇa*) by both Ānandātīrtha and Sāyana, and is probably so intended, as Max Müller takes it.

<sup>7</sup> Sāyana renders 'word', but this is less likely. He adds that it means also 'quarter-verse'. For the intrans. *gādi*—which (as *apādi*) is recognized by Pāṇini—cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 365, Whitney, l. c., § 845, Speyer, l. c., § 170. In Jaminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 9, 9, *avasi* seems transitive, but see Oertel's note. The use of the *nor* here is hard to distinguish from that of the imperfect, as with *akṣiprāgāt* above. But in these cases it is possible that the *nor* has a sense almost present, a natural derivation from the true *norist* sense of the immediate past (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 65, 67; Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 552 (iv); Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930, who points out that it is especially frequent in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṁhitā). It is also possible that the imperfect sense may be old (despite Whitney, § 929 a), for it is found in the Mantra literature. In the case of *akṣiprāgāt* there is the further possibility that after *āhi* it means 'he sang of all this' or 'he sang towards *āhi* this' (*akṣiprāgāt* occurs in the RV.), and in an imperfect from *√gi*, for *gi* occurs in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa and the Mahābhārata (cf. Whitney, § 855, and *St. Petersburg Diet.*, s. v.), or even from *√gī*, go. I do not therefore think these forms are signs of late date.

<sup>8</sup> 'Without him' is Max Müller's rendering. That of the text is supported by Ānandātīrtha, the other version by Sāyana. Cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 441.

<sup>9</sup> Sāyana takes *śāśāḥ* as the aspirated sonants, *śā, śā, śā, śā, śā*, as in R̥gveda Prātikhya, 714; Siddhāntakumudī (cf. Tīrthānātha), p. 14; Max Müller, *R̥gveda Prātikhya*, p. cclxi. It can hardly here, however, have this limited sense. Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, II, 22, 3; all vowels are *śāśāḥ*.

<sup>10</sup> Oldenberg (*Z. D. M. G.*, XLII, 199-247) has shown conclusively that few if any of the

3 Indra<sup>1</sup> sat down beside Viśvāmitra who was about to recite the hymns of this day. He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *brhatis*. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. Do thou, seer, repeat a second<sup>2</sup> hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *brhatis* verses. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. Do thou, seer, repeat a third hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *brhatis* verses. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. I give thee a boon.' He said, 'Let me know thee.' Indra said, 'I am breath, thou, seer, art breath, all creatures are breath, he that shines is breath. In this form I pervade all the quarters. This my food is my friend, my support.' This is the food of Viśvāmitra.<sup>4</sup> I am he that shines. Thus said he.<sup>5</sup>

4 This is produced as a thousand *brhatis*.<sup>6</sup> The consonants<sup>7</sup> are the body, hymns of the R̥gveda go back to their nominal composers when these composers are the heads of the great families, but that they were written by members of the family. The only possible exceptions are Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra under Sudis (p. 236). It is possible that here (p. 226 n. 1) a recollection of the facts is seen in that book V is ascribed to the Atri, while the others to individuals: Gṛtsamada, Viśvāmitra, &c., but more probably the plural is used because it gives the proper play of words with *atrayata*. This is not, however, a sign of late date, for it seems likely that in RV, 1, 181, the author held the same view as he attributes to Vasiṣṭha the *rakṣantā* (VII, 31, 27, 23) and to Bharadvāja the *brhat* (VI, 46, 1, 2), later attributed to Śaṁyū Barhaspatya (Oldenberg, pp. 215, 227, n. 1).

<sup>1</sup> Sayana explains that this *khanda* shows the nature of the *astis* as being Indra's food. The form *upanīsatada* is wrong and can easily be corrected, but it is as old as Śākara. The Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 3, 7, has *upanīsatada*.

<sup>2</sup> The collection of verses is regarded as three *astis* of tristuchs, in *gāyatrī*, *brhatī*, and *anuk* respectively. For them, see V, 2, 3 and notes.

<sup>3</sup> Ānandatīrtha explains *dakṣiṇam* as *dakṣiṇhoge vīṣṭa deṣaḥ pāṇaḥ jayoh aś dakṣiṇaḥ* *mitraḥ śrīraṇatāś dakṣiṇam* *is napaṇṇakaprajapah*. Śāyana refers the use to *abhiyuddhātātātāt*, citing Dhātupāṭha, XI, 1, 7. This sense must be somewhat as in the text.

<sup>4</sup> Ānandatīrtha explains *Viśvāmitram* as *Ramayāśhikamanyamēnabhrallīśaśrābhjām* *annam* *iśvāmitrīnaḥ samṛddhātāt ad vīṣṭaḥ mitram* *ity ucyate*. Sayana has: *iśvāmitrīnaḥ samṛddhātāt ad vīṣṭaḥ iśvāmitram*.

<sup>5</sup> In Śaṅkharāya Āranyaka, I, 6, there occurs a dialogue between Indra and Viśvāmitra. It seems to show clear signs of a later origin, though it verbally reproduces some of this dialogue. It is much more philosophical. The Jaiminiya version, I c., is very much altered, but all have clearly a common source, and use the narrative perfect (cf. Intro., p. 67). The threefold boon may be compared with the story of Niskēśas (Khāṇḍa Upaniṣad).

<sup>6</sup> This *khanda* gives the correspondence of the various *astis* of the 1000 *brhatis* hymn, which is got by the addition of the verses of the whole Niskēśaśāstra, to parts of the body of *prāṇa* (Śāyana). Ānandatīrtha explains it as an identification of the various deities who preside over the seasons, &c. The number, 1000, is a number, 'hundred' (cf. V, 2, 5, XLIII, 111) counted about 37,200, and though the number could be reduced in various ways, it is not worth while.

<sup>7</sup> What are called by Pāṇini *As* (Śāyana). The Nāsmāya school adopt the term *vyājanā*.

the vowels<sup>2</sup> the soul, the sibilants<sup>4</sup> the breath. Knowing this he became Vasistha<sup>5</sup>. Thence took he the name. Indra proclaimed this to Viśvāmitra, Indra proclaimed this to Bharadvāja, so Indra is in sacrifices invoked by him as a friend<sup>6</sup>. This is produced as a thousand *brhatis*. Of this produced as a thousand *brhatis* there are thirty  $\times$  thousand syllables. So many thousands are the days of a hundred years. They make up the nights by the consonants, the days by the vowels<sup>7</sup>. This is produced as a thousand *brhatis*. After this being produced as a thousand *brhatis* he who knows this becomes full of knowledge,<sup>8</sup> of the gods, of *brahman*, of the immortal, and goes to the gods. What I am<sup>9</sup> he is, what he is, I am. A Rṣi says (RV I, 115, 1), 'The sun is the self of all that goes or stands'. Let one consider this.

### ADHYAYA 3

He who knows himself as the fivefold hymn<sup>1</sup> from whence all this springs, he is wise. Earth, air, ether, water, light, these form the self, the fivefold hymn. From him all arises, into him all resolves. He who knows this is a refuge

for *āditi*s as do the Sarasvatī. The term corresponds with the use of the Rgveda Pratiśakhya, see Max Müller's edit., pp. xlii sq., and with the Śrauta Sūtras. *St. Petersburg Diet.*, s. v.

<sup>2</sup> Sayana takes this as in II, 2, 2, n. 12, as aspirated consonants. This can hardly be accepted. *Ātma* is taken by him as *madhyatarāṃ*. The vowels must somewhere be alluded to, and *ghata* can be = *vara*.

<sup>3</sup> Ānandatīrtha and Sayana both render *śaśaś*. The Kaumara school also take this term. In the Rgveda Pratiśakhya it includes *anuvāra*, *virarga*, *jāyamañīya*, and *upodāmanya*, in the other Pratiśakhya it refers to *śatatahah*.

<sup>4</sup> Sayana here ascribes the name to him causing to dwell, and his covering, cf. II, 2, 2 n. 2. Ānandatīrtha prefers 'best of dwellers'.

<sup>5</sup> Sayana refers this to the Subrahmanya rite of the Soma sacrifice, where Indra is called, *Indra a gachā, haviṣ a gachā* (Sāṃvāda Brahmana, I, 1, 12, Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, I, 12, 3 &c.).

<sup>6</sup> The Kaumara school thus defines *śaśaś*, *Katantra* I, 1, *addhā varṇasamamanyak* | *śatra catuṣṭadāśatā varṇak* (Sayana). See Max Müller, *op. cit.*, p. x.

<sup>7</sup> Sayana appears to take the first part of the sentence as independent, and as describing *śrānadarāś*. For *śrāśaś* *apyaś* cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2, Atareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 24, 5. No doubt the acc. is mainly governed by the verb, but the prep. force of *apyaś* is too much ignored in Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 87.

<sup>8</sup> This no doubt refers to the identity of the sun and the self, one of the oldest forms of Brahminical monism. Sayana illustrates the doctrine by a quotation from the commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, III, 3. Sun worship is a very early and widespread form of religion, cf. Farnell, *Cults of Greek States* IV, 243, Evans, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1901, pp. 208 sq., Marucci, *Storia di Moscor* (trans. by Irvine) III, 3 for its real importance in India.

<sup>9</sup> Ānandatīrtha explains that there are three *āditi*s and a *pārāśāstra* and an *uttarabhogya*. These correspond to the five forms of Vishnu, Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha, who represent earth, ether, air, light, and water respectively.



for his friends. To him<sup>2</sup> who knows food and feeder = feeder<sup>3</sup> is born, and food is his. Food is water and earth, for of them are foods compounded. Light and air are the feeder, for by them<sup>4</sup> he eats food. Either is the bowl for in the ether is all poured. He who knows this becomes the refuge (bowl) of his friends. To him who knows food and feeder a feeder is born, and food is his. Plants and trees are food, animals the feeder, for animals eat plants and trees. Of animals, those who have teeth above and below and are formed like men,<sup>5</sup> are feeders, the rest food. They overcome therefore the other animals, for the feeder is over his food. He becomes over his friends who knows this<sup>6</sup>.

2 He who knows more and more clearly the self obtains fuller being<sup>1</sup>. There are plants and trees and animals, and he knows the self more and more clearly (in them). For in plants and trees sap only is seen, in animals consciousness. In animals the self becomes more and more clear, because in them sap also is seen, while thought is not seen in others<sup>2</sup>. The self = more and more clear

<sup>2</sup> *Taimin* may refer to the *uttha* as Sayana and Max Müller take it. Or it may be merely a precursor of *anman*, in accordance with the usual preference of Sanskrit for the order *sa ja śa*.

<sup>3</sup> i.e. a son able to eat. The second *aya* must, I think, refer to the father, not the son. The change of reference is too abrupt to be probable and either version = good sense. Sayana takes it as referring to the son. For the form *a jayate*, cf. Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 27, 6.

<sup>4</sup> They and digestion.

<sup>5</sup> Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben* pp. 74-76) shows the identity of the contrast between *ubhayaśānt* and other animals, which is found in the Samhitās with the old Latin contrast of *ambidens* (in Festus not = *didens*) and *ambidors* in Aristotle. That however, *ubhayaśānt* originally included the first class of sacrificial animals with man, as he holds (p. 76) appears doubtful. In this passage the resemblance to man is made explicit, and this is scarcely so likely if man were naturally one of the *ubhayaśānt* class. Either *anu vidham* or the indeclinable *anuvadhān* (as in III, 2, 3) is grammatically possible, but the corruption to *anuvadhān* would be much easier than to *anu vidham*. *Anuvadhān* is also possible. *ī adhi* occurs several times *infra* II, 3, 4, 5. Cf. *vidham anuvadhān*, Maṭṭyañi Samhitā, III, 2, 4, 10.

<sup>6</sup> In *adhiṣṭa caranti* the acc. is governed by *adhi*, a use found in Mantra and Brāhmaṇa alike (Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, II, 87, 88, Atharvaveda XI, 49, 2 *adhi vishany aruṣa gābhira* RV, VIII, 68, 15<sup>b</sup> *adhi tathan namam vatham*, Vajasaneyi Samhitā, VI, 2 *adhi tva śikatyate* &c.). I do not, however, think it can well be construed with the gen., so I think the gen. *ramanandam* is a partitive one 'of his friends he, &c.' For similar cases of the partitive gen., cf. I, 2, 3 n. 6 and Harvaṇṇia, II, 79, 12, where Hopkins / A O S, XXII, 152, n. 1, takes the gen. as local. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 441) is, I think, wrong in holding that *adhi* rarely has the accusative. The root *sthā*, e.g., would not naturally take an acc. without the aid of a preposition. Cf. II, 2, 4 n. 8.

<sup>7</sup> This is the most philosophical part of the whole Āranyaka and is a determined effort to explain the diverse stages of conscious life. It will be observed that the distinctive marks of man are all elements which make his consciousness into an ordered system and they imply self-consciousness, as opposed to the mere consciousness of animals in the form of their receptivity of external stimuli. The theory of the soul in Aristotle *De Anima*, II, 4, 19, is worth comparing. For the form *anustandam* cf. I, 4, 1, n. 21, Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber.*, 1893, p. 11.

<sup>8</sup> Max Müller renders, 'but in others thought is not seen,' the apparent meaning being that

in man. For he is most endowed with intelligence, he says what he has known, he sees what he has known, he knows to-morrow, he knows the world and what is not the world. By the mortal he desires the immortal, being thus endowed. As for the others, animals, hunger and thirst comprise their power of knowledge. They say not what they have known, they see not what they have known. They know not to-morrow, they know not the world and what is not the world. They go as far, for their experiences are according to the measure of their intelligence.<sup>3</sup>

3 This man is the sea,<sup>2</sup> he is above all the world. Whatever he reaches, he desires to be beyond it.<sup>3</sup> If he gains the sky world, he desires to be beyond it. If he were to gain yonder world, he would desire to be beyond it. Fivefold is this man.<sup>4</sup> What is hot in him is fire; the apertures are the ether, blood, mucus, and seed are water, the body is earth, the breath is air. Fivefold is the air,<sup>4</sup> up-breathing, down breathing, back-breathing, out-breathing, on-breathing

some animated beings have not thought. What must be meant is that others, i.e. plants and trees, have no intelligence, and in Sayana and Ānandaturtha construe *ṁ* *ḥara* frequently means, like *śālo* and *ahur*, others, not as opposed to a part of a species, but as another species, *A J P*, VII, 101. Stones have only *sattā*, says Sayana, i.e. are only objective, not also subjective.

<sup>3</sup> Sayana takes the last sentence as meaning they are born according to their knowledge in a former birth. This, however, assumes the transmigration theory, which is not certainly known in this Aranyaka. The better meaning seems to be that taken above, which is more suited in point of fact to the context for the idea of former birth is nowise necessary or in point. Sayana cites *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad*, IV, 4, 2 and 7, but this *Upaniṣad* is earlier. The word *yathāgrāham* does not occur in Jacob's *Concordance*. Kannīaki *Upaniṣad*, I, 2, has *yathāgrāham* of transmigration. See also Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 96 sq.

<sup>2</sup> The sea is typical of all unsatisfied desires. Sayana cites *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa*, II, 2, 6 *hamam jansidraṁ avreṇety āha | samudra ita hi hamah | maha hi hamatyanto 'ste na samu drasya*. The same idea appears over and again in the Greek Anthology, cf. *Butcher, Greek Genius*, pp. 166 sq. For the separation of the prefix and verb, cf. *Introd.*, p. 37, and examples from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* in *Liebeck, Panini*, p. 24, and from *Bṛhadaranyaka*, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Enam* in R and in Sayana must stand for *m* in place of an assimilated *n*, as in II, 1, 5 n 6. For *at* *aman*, cf. *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa*, I, 42 (*J A O S*, XV, 234).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. II, 3, 1, n 1. Ānandaturtha here repeats the identifications with the different forms of *Vāna*.

<sup>5</sup> The five *prāṇas* frequently occur. No intelligible explanation of them is possible. *Prāṇa* and *apāṇa*, once originally the same, were first divided as expiration and inspiration, then as breath, and the wind of digestion, cf. II, 4, 1 and 2. *Uyāna* 'through breathing or circulating air' (Egeling *S B E*, XLIII, 163, n 1) is the bond between the *prāṇa* and *apāṇa*. *Samāna*, which 'introduces the ingested quies through the united' (Egeling, p. 164, n 1), leads to union of the two first. *Udāna* conducts the soul from the body at death. See Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 249-252, E. T., pp. 276-280, and I, 3, 7, n 6. Sayana says that *prāṇa* is in the mouth and nose, rising from the heart, *apāṇa* is in the lower parts, rising in all the veins, *mūṇa* in the throat to lead forth the soul, *samāna* leads food and drink evenly through the whole body. *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, II, 5, 6 adds *śvāna* to the number. For further variations see *sa* 1, 3, 7, 4, 1. The same five as here occur in *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* II, 1, 4, 2-6, and *Maitriya Upaniṣad*, II, 6, where see Cowell's

The duties, sight, hearing, mind, and speech, are comprised in up-breathing and down breathing. For they depart with the departure of breath. He is the succession<sup>1</sup> of speech and thought which is the sacrifice. The sacrifice is fivefold, Agnihotra, new and full moon sacrifices, the four monthly sacrifices, the animal sacrifice, and the Soma sacrifice. The Soma-sacrifice is the most perfect of the sacrifices, for these five kinds are seen in it, that which precedes the libations,<sup>2</sup> is one, then there are three libations, and the rest (of the sacrifice) is the fifth.

4 He<sup>3</sup> who knows one sacrifice above the other, one day above the other, one god above the gods, is clever. This great litany is the sacrifice above the other, the day above the other, the god above the others. This litany is fivefold. As a chorus<sup>4</sup> it is *trivṛt*, *pañcadāsa*, *saptadāsa*, *ekaviṃśa*, and

notes, and Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 293. With the following, cf. Bhādaranyaka Upaniṣad (Kāṇva), I, 4, 17, where man, animal, sacrifice, and *śrīṣṭam idam* are all fivefold, and Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I, 7, 1, where mind, speech, breath, sight, and hearing are man.

<sup>1</sup> For *ustarottar*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 60. For *aps* + *4/1*, cf. Caland *Altind. Zeitschrift*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> That is the *dāsa*. The last is the *avasthika udavasaniya*, see Hillebrandt, *Kritische Literatur*, pp. 97 sq. It is worth noting that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa does not deal with the new and full moon or the four monthly sacrifices, though the Kaṇva does, cf. *Introd.*, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> This section is unusually foolish. Ānandātīrtha exercises much ingenuity in equating the five forms of Viṣṇu to the several members of each of the sets of five. The parts of the *śaman* are also dealt with in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 9, 10. See Hillebrandt, *Kritische Literatur*, p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Sayana explains these as follows: *trivṛt śama* is formed by the three hymns at the beginning of the Samaveda Utiṣaraka, 1, 9, RV, IX, 11, 1-3, 64, 18, 30, 65, 20-12. The first three verses are taken from the first verse of each *śikha*, the second from the second verses, and the third from the third. It is called *udya*. The *pañcadāsa* is formed out of one hymn, by repeating the first verse three times, the second and third once each, then repeating the second three times, and so on. The *saptadāsa* is the *pañcadāsa* save that in the third round the second and third verses each are repeated thrice, i.e. (1) aaabc, (2) abbbc, (3) abbbccc. The *ekaviṃśa* is made by singing all verses three times, except the last first and second respectively in the three rounds, i.e. (1) aaabbbc, (2) abbbccc (or aaabccc—the MSS vary), (3) aaabccc (or abbbccc). The *pañcaviṃśa* is formed by singing in the first round the first verse thrice, the second four times the third once, in the second round, the first once, the second thrice, the third four times, in the third round, the first five times, the second once, the third three times, according to Dharmapāya, or the first four times the second twice, the third thrice, according to Gāṇṭhī. (This seems to be the sense, R's version is corrupt and S is imperfect.) These *śaman*s are called *pañcaviṃśa* (not as Max Müller, *vidyā*, which is the generic title of which these are species), *śaṣṭadāsa*, and *saptaviṃśa*, no name for the last being given. Max Müller quotes Mahidhara on *Yajurveda Saṃhitā* X, 9 for the *trivṛt*. More in point is Sayana on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 42 which closely resembles this passage. The *St Petersburg Dict.* (s.v. *trivṛt*) gives the *trivṛt* as consisting of one *śikha*, RV, IX, 11 only, see Eggeling *S B E*, XXVI, 308, 309, *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, I, 11 sq., II, 1, 1, 7, 1, 14, 1, Hillebrandt *l.c.*, p. 102, and schemes in Caland and Henry's *L'Agnistoma*.

*pañcalimsa* As a *sāman*<sup>1</sup> it is *gayatra*, *rathantara*, *brhat*, *bhadra*, and *rājana*. As to metre it is *gayatri*, *usuh*, *brhati*, *tristubh*, and *dupadā*. The explanation<sup>2</sup> is that it is the head, the right wing, the left wing, the tail, and the body (of the bird). He performs<sup>3</sup> the *prastava* five times, the *udgītha* five times, the *prathihāra* five times, the *upadrava* five times, the *udhāna* five times. This forms a thousand syllables<sup>4</sup>. The verses here are recited = five orders<sup>5</sup>. What precedes the eighty tristichs is one order; then come the three sets of eighty tristichs, and the fifth consists of the rest. Thus makes a thousand (verses)<sup>6</sup>. That = the whole, these ten by tens are the whole. For number is such. Ten tens are a hundred, ten hundreds a thousand, and that = the whole. These are the three metres, this food indeed is threefold, eating, drinking, and chewing. He obtains this food by these.

5 This = produced as a thousand *brhatīs*. Some recognize a thousand of various metres, saying, 'Is there another?' let us say there is'. Some say a thousand *tristubhs*, some a thousand *gayatīs*, some a thousand *anustubhs*. A Rsi says (RV, X, 124, 9), 'Sages in their wisdom discovered Indra dancing an *anustubh*'<sup>7</sup>. That denotes, they discovered in speech then the breath of Indra. He can become famous and of splendid renown. 'Rather' he is liable to die untimely,<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The *gayatra sāman* is formed from RV, III, 62, 10, *rathantara* from RV, VII, 31, 22, the *brhat* from RV, VI 46, 1, the *bhadra* from RV, X, 157, 1, the *rājana* from RV, VII, 27 1, according to Sayana's note, cf V, 7, 2, n 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Āranyaka, I, 4 2.

<sup>3</sup> The *sāman* of the Niskeralya is the *rājana*, and each of its usual five parts is repeated five times. The *upadrava* falls to the Udgāt and all join in the *udhāna* (Sāyana).

<sup>4</sup> The *stobhas* are meaningless syllables, added = verses sung to make up the metre. See Chandogya Upanisad, I, 12. These syllables are marked = Samaveda MSS, but they have not as yet been satisfactorily explained. Cf Burnell, *Samhitopaniṣad Brahmana*, p xviii, Hillebrandt, I a, p 104, n 15, Caland and Henry, op cit, App II.

<sup>5</sup> The verses corresponding to the body, head, wings, &c, are the first order, the three *astīs* follow, then come the belly and chest verses.

<sup>6</sup> There are 1000 *stobhas* and also in the whole Śāstra a 1000 *brhatas*. The rest refers to the nature of number as being measured by tens. There are nothing but sets of ten. The three 'metres' mean, according to Sayana, the numbers 10, 100, 1000 which govern all numbers. This however is inadequate, as the reference is clearly to the three sets of *astīs*. The reference to food = because these *astīs* are the food of the bird. There is no sign that the numbers 100 or 1000 are to be treated = specially important. Sayana's explanation is otherwise good. He quotes for *dalatīḥ*, Panini, V, 1, 60. Anandathītha is very weak on this point.

<sup>7</sup> Sāyana takes *kim anyat* as the question, and the answer. The others do not include the Śākhayanas, who also recognize a thousand *brhatas*. This is rather in favour of an early date, the dispute had disappeared before the Śākhayana Āranyaka. *Anant* may be adverbial, 'variously'.

<sup>8</sup> Sayana explains that the clouds rumbling produce a sound with an *anustubh* in it, cf Geldner, *Indische Studien*, II, 304, v Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp 40, 41.

<sup>9</sup> Anandathītha takes the whole as one argument and as meaning, 'he can die when he likes.' This is impossible. For the construction, cf I, 1, 1, n 4.

he<sup>4</sup> declares. For the self that in speech is imperfect, since<sup>5</sup> a man understands if driven to thought by breath, not if driven by speech. Let him produce the *brhati*,<sup>6</sup> for the *brhati* is the whole self. The self is on all sides surrounded by members, and, as the self is on all sides surrounded by members,<sup>7</sup> so is the *brhati* on all sides surrounded by metres. The self is the middle of the members, and the *brhati* of metres.<sup>8</sup> He can become famous and of splendid renown, while the other<sup>9</sup> will die untimely, so said he. For the *brhati* is the whole self. Therefore let him produce the *brhati*.

■ This is produced as a thousand *brhatīs*. Of this produced as a thousand *brhatīs*, there are eleven hundred and twenty-five *anuvāḥas*.<sup>1</sup> For by the larger the smaller is comprehended. A R<sup>1</sup> says (RV, VIII, 76, 12), 'I a speech of eight feet,' for there are eight feet of four syllables. 'Of nine corners,' for the *brhati*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Anandātirtha points out that 'he' is Aitareya Mahadasa or Mahatāreya. Sayana vaguely says 'a wise man'. Cf. I, 1, 1, n. 3.

<sup>5</sup> This is very obscure. The version here adopted means that the activity of *manas* if evoked by speech (= *anuvāḥa*) only is imperfect, but it is more perfect if evoked by breath (= *brhati*). *Manas* will then stand in its wider sense, not as an *indriya*, as later, cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 245, E. T., p. 271. This is very strained, but at least it is less absurd than (1) Sayana's version, 'If he proceeds with the Śāstra with reference to the *anuvāḥa* which is proclaimed as *vac*, and not with reference to the *brhati* which is proclaimed as *prana*, then being driven by his mind he does not manage the Śāstra by speech alone'. He adds that without breath speech merely conceived is inadequate, breath being essential for any sense activity. The idea is not unlike the one adopted above. (2) Anandātirtha renders, 'Being urged to objects of sense by *prana*, i.e. *vāyu*, and by *manas*, i.e. *śiva*, he enjoys them, and not by voice alone'. He read *manas* because he tries to account for the *e*. Sayana must have read *prana na* and taken *vac* as an accusative or locative, as Max Müller points out. For the *dat*, which is rarely found in the local sense in the Bṛāhmaṇa style (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 144), see Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 43, and cf. II, 2, 2, n. 7.

<sup>6</sup> I e. make out that the *brhati* is the metre.

<sup>7</sup> Because it is surrounded in the Śāstra (Sayana).

<sup>8</sup> Because metres are both bigger and smaller than the *brhati*.

<sup>9</sup> Sayana ignores the difficulty of this passage. Anandātirtha of course renders it, 'he is able to die at will'. The text follows Max Müller's version. The syntax *pad brhati* is very common in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 43, &c., Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 4 &c.; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 564.

<sup>1</sup> 1000 × 36 syllables (*brhatīs*) = 1125 × 32 syllables (*anuvāḥas*).

<sup>2</sup> I e. It is nine feet of four syllables and is formed by adding one to the eight feet of the *anuvāḥa*. Sayana says the MS. *navavāḥa* is *chindana*. Cf. Denfey, *Samaveda, Glossary*, p. 87. The correction *navavāḥa*, though easy, is more convincing, because of *r* following Cf. Wachernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 32, Macdonell, *Sadā Grammar*, p. 63, n. 15. MSS frequently differ in such points, cf. Whitney's note on AV, VI, 33, 2 (*vyākṛi*), cf. V, 1, 1, n. 18, 2, 1, n. 6. Note should be taken here of the readings of the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 2, 6 *śāstramāṇa* is the acc., and I, 23, 15 and 23 *śāstramāṇa* *anuvāḥa* combined with Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 6 *śāstramāṇa* *ayam te* (see Haug, p. 211). I confess that the possible explanation suggested by Dr. Haug of these cases as either contractions with omission of *anuvāḥa* or *śāstra* or as neutrals is not attractive. In the last case, as perhaps here, the original may have been as Dr. Haug also suggests *śāstramāṇa* (*ā*) (*ayam te*, &c., with the loss

becomes nine-cornered. 'Touching the truth,' for speech\* united with verse  
 ■ truth. 'I made\* the body out of Indra,' for from this thousand *brāhmi*  
 made into *anustubh*, which is *prana* connected with Indra, and from the  
*brāhmi* he makes speech, the *anustubh*, as a body. The great liany is the  
 highest development of speech, and it ■ fivefold, measured, unmeasured, music,  
 true, and untrue. A *re* verse, a *gāthā*,\* a *kumbhā*,\* are measured, a *yajus* verse,  
 an invocation, conversation,\* are not measured, a *saman* or part of it ■ music;  
 om ■ true, no is untrue. The flower and fruit of speech is what is true. He  
 can become famous and of splendid renown, for he speaks the truth, the flower  
 and fruit of speech. The untrue is the root of speech, and, as a tree with  
 roots exposed dries up, and perishes, so a man who speaks untruth exposes  
 his roots, dries up, and perishes. Therefore let a man speak not untruth, but  
 guard himself against it. The syllable\* om is empty and goes forward. So if

of *ō* (as often in MSS in *pausa*) and subsequent erroneous contraction. So *pañcasiṃhāt*(*ṃ*)  
 may have been written by error in the MS and then the *ṃ* dropped and contraction applied.  
 But in verse, of course, we find clear cases of contraction or of the use of shortened forms, especially  
 so for *eva*, e.g. Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, XII, 29 *putram eva must matre causa be putreva* or  
*putreva* *ca*, probably the former, Oldenberg, *Z D A G*, LXI, 830, Roth, *ibid*, XLVIII, 68.

\* Speech is *anustubh*, verse *brāhmi*, and united they touch *prana*. Ānandavīrha explains by  
 equating *brāhmi* with a form of *Viṣṇu* and speech with *Udāt*.

\* 'He makes' in Max Müller's translation, ignores *aham*. Śāyana does not do this,  
 but ■ explains the sentence by the action of the *Itor*, as the Aranyaka uses the third person.  
 It only means that the *anustubh* is made out of the *brāhmi* which is identified with *prana*,  
 and *prana* ■ (see II, 2, 3) Indra.

\* Śāyana defines a *gāthā* as *śarvalokaprasiddharthapratipadikā*, e.g. *prajāḥ prolar anṛtam*  
*te vadanti* (a *yajñagāthā* from *Atareya Brāhmaṇa*, V, 31, 6, the example is not very happy),  
 Ānandavīrha as *parāparam āmanam cāmanasambhāṣanāni cāmanasambhāṣanāni āmanā-*  
*śakyam*. Cf Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 365 sq. *St Petersburg Diet*, II, 737, Aufrecht,  
*Atareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 429, Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p. 196.

\* Śāyana defines as *śāntakṣipra*, e.g. *brāhmacārya aya āpo 'ana karmā kuru divi ma*  
*svastikā* or *ma svastikā* (the MSS vary), i.e. *Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra*, I, 21, 2, Ānandavīrha as  
*yajñagāthānyam*. In the parallel passage, *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XI, 5, 7, 10 (where see  
 Eggeling's trans., *S B E*, XLIV, 101) *kunvya* is real, which Weber (*Ind. Stud*, 2,  
 111, n. 1) suggests as equal to 'refrain', cf. *kumbā kura*.

\* Śāyana explains *brāhmaṇagatya ye 'vithāda* *ya cā rajasādhadām parihāsa śrāpēnoyāḥ* as  
*śarva vithāda*, Ānandavīrha simply has *nyarthakā*. Cf *Vedische Studien* I, 118, 318. For  
*ugada* see *St Petersburg Diet*, s.v., Bhadddevata, VIII, 104, Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch.*  
*Litt*, I, 142, n, who describes them as a kind of Yajus to summon the other priests to perform  
 their tasks. Śāyana gives as an example: *uk a yajña Agne mahān asy brāhmaṇa dhārata*  
 (=Taittiriya Samhitā, II 5, 9 1, Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 264). For *saman*, cf.  
 Winternitz, p. 146, n. 3, who renders it as originally 'Besamfigungsbild', 'ein Mittel zur Be-  
 schwichtigung von Gottern und Dämonen', Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p. 38.

\* A curious piece of common sense (cf. Mr. Falconer's advice to Pepsy, *Diary*, Aug 8,  
 1862) interpolated to avoid the danger of the preceding doctrine that *om* is truth. For *om*  
 as *tatva*, see *Atareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 18, and *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, I, 1, 8. The comparison  
 with *amṛta* is of course accidental, Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt*, I, 162, n. 1.

a man says *om*, then that<sup>1</sup> is taken from him, if he should say *om* to everything, he would empty himself and be unable to have delights. The syllable 'no' is full<sup>2</sup> for one's self. If a man should say 'no' to everything, his fame would be evil and he would destroy himself. Therefore should one give in the proper time, and at the proper time he should refrain<sup>3</sup> from giving. So does he unite the true and the untrue. From their union he grows and becomes greater. He who knows this speech of which (the great many) is a modification, he is clever. 'A' is the whole of speech and being manifested<sup>4</sup> through the mutes and sibilants it becomes manifold and various. If uttered in a whisper it is breath, if aloud it is body. Therefore it is as it were hidden, for what is incorporeal is as it were hidden, and breath is incorporeal. But spoken aloud it is body and visible, for body is visible.

7 This is produced as a thousand *brhātis*. It is glory,<sup>5</sup> it is Indra, it is the lord of creatures. 'He who knows it as Indra, as the lord of creatures, leaves this world shaking<sup>6</sup> off all ties,' so said Mahidasa<sup>7</sup> Āitareya. Having departed, having become Indra,<sup>8</sup> he shines in those worlds. They say, 'If by this form he gains yonder world, then by what form does he experience this world?'

<sup>1</sup> Sayana construes as 'he is emptied for that, viz. the enjoyment of house, fields, &c.' This is to force the meaning of *amas* overmuch, it is a *dativus accomodi*.

<sup>2</sup> Is selfish. Sayana cites Bhagavadgītā, II, 34 *sambhavitāya takirīr maraṇad atiracyale* |

<sup>3</sup> Rajendralāla prints in text and commentary *kalema*. It should be *kāle na* as the commentary and also Anandātīrtha, shows.

<sup>4</sup> 'A' with the different letters is the source of the alphabet. It may be interesting to speculate if this denotes that writing where the 'a' was not expressed was already known. It may be so, but it is not clear. In any case as the date of writing is very doubtful, no great light would be thrown on the date of the Āranyaka, cf V 3, 3 || 6a, where the reference is clear but cogent only for Śaunaka's period. For later reference to the *aldra* see Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 2 and cf Tandya Mahābrahmana, 22, 14.

<sup>5</sup> Sayana compares Taittirīya Āranyaka I 1 *na tasya kale kalcama tasya nama mahāyala* | For Indra, cf II, 4, 3. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 4, Kaṇṇakī Upaniṣad, II 6, III 1. Bṛhad āranyaka Upaniṣad, III 2.

<sup>6</sup> This is the sense rather than, 'Indra is the lord as taken by Max Müller. Elsewhere below is the usual Sanskrit attraction of a pronoun to the gender of the predicate, *fergl Syntax*, III, 240 sq.

<sup>7</sup> This must be the sense, and so both Sayana and Anandātīrtha take it. Originally the word meant the decay of old age.

<sup>8</sup> The quotation ends here, it seems. The new sentence looks like a prose version of a Śloka cf V, 3.

<sup>9</sup> Sayana quotes Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV 1 2 *devo bhūtvā devaṃ ajyeta* | He refers also to Brahma Sūtra, IV, 3 15, and discusses whether this deification is a hindrance to real *mukti* and decides it is really a step towards it. But of course the doctrine of *mukti* is not clearly found in this Āranyaka, see II, 1 2 || 9, Hopk. as *Religions of India* pp 232, 238 sq.

<sup>10</sup> For the nasal || *phuts*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 299, 300, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 78.

The blood in the woman<sup>1</sup> is the form of Agni, therefore one should despise it not. The seed in the man is the form of Āditya, therefore one should despise it not. This self gives itself to that self, that self gives itself to this self<sup>2</sup>. They thus gain each other. In this form<sup>3</sup> he gains yonder world, in that form he experiences this world.

8 Here there are these verses <sup>1</sup>—

\* Anandaurtha has a wonderful explanation: This world and that world are both *svastivāpasa* of Bhagavānt. Sayana explains that there are six elements in the body, three, fat, bone, and marrow, are white and represent the man, three, skin, blood, and flesh, are red, and represent the woman. *ayam* = used of the woman because she is connected with earth, *aram* of the man because he is connected with the sun and the upper world.

<sup>1</sup> The fact that Sayana does not comment on *amānāsa* shows how little he can be relied on to note points in the text. The reading is quite certain, and cf Whitney, § c, § 502 b.

<sup>1</sup> This is taken by Sayana and by Max Müller as referring to the words at once preceding. But it is perhaps rather a reference to the question above. Then *arena* will refer to the knowledge of Indra, and *amṛta* to the human form produced by the union of the parents. Sayana seems to have been misled by the use of Agni and Āditya into misinterpreting *lokaṁ*. The tone of the section is noteworthy when contrasted with the pessimism which the body and its imperfections induces in Buddhism and the later Upaniṣads (Maitrayani Upaniṣad, I, 2-4, Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 224). Max Müller's view (*S. B. L.*, XV, 1-1n) that, despite its references to Nirvana (p. xln) and other hints at Buddhism (e.g. VII, 8), this Upaniṣad is anti-Buddhist cannot be supported. The irregular Sandhi is merely a conscious and deliberate misnomer (so perhaps also in the Manava Grhya Sutra, a piece of patchwork), and generally the language is quite recent in form compared to the really old Upaniṣads. Deussen recognises the later character and style of the Upaniṣad and Winternitz (p. 225) definitely refers it to a post-Buddhist date. Indeed Weber (*Indian Literature* pp. 96 sq.) and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 230, 231) tend to refer it to classical times though its doctrine is no doubt earlier. The optimism of the Upaniṣads is natural: what is other than the *ātman* is miserable, but not the *ātman*, cf. Bhṛataraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 5, Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 9, III, 6, Īśa Upaniṣad, 7. Hopkins, *Religions of India* p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> The verses are probably older than the prose. They are earlier than the *śrutiśloka* cited by Patanjali (cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 483 sq.) and show every sign of antiquity in their metrical form (cf. J. R. A. S., 1906 pp. 1-10, Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXV, xxxv, Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 194 sq.) which is decidedly irregular. The third verses of 1, 2, 4 are *paetaśloka*, the first verse of 1 has only ten syllables, the last verse of 4 only 9 and even if by resolutions they are altered into 11 syllable verses, then the characteristic *śrutiśloka* ending is missing. In no case are the four verses assimilated, and indeed in no case are even two verses assimilated. The last stanza, *paetaśloka*, is in iambic ended *anvutśloka*, a very early verse indeed. It is of course true, as Bloomfield (*Atharvaveda*, III, 41, 42) points out that the actual development of the *anvutśloka* (*paetaśloka* 1 and 3) cannot possibly have been from  $\underline{\text{u u u u u u u u}}$  to  $\underline{\text{u - u - u - u}}$  and thence to the Epic *Sloka* with its differentiated *paetaśloka*, but that the iambic *anvutśloka* is a priestly as opposed to a popular verse with free *paetaśloka* 1 and 3. But it is equally clear that the development of the iambic *anvutśloka* in the poetical circles was comparatively early and that the later verse writers tended more and more to fall back (with eporic cases of imitation) such as in the *Vimada* hymns, see my criticisms\* of Arnold's *Vedic Metre*, in J. R. A. S., 1906.

\* I may note here a small point confirmatory of my criticism of Prof Arnold's views. The term *dakṣiṇa* (*śāḍa*) occurs in RV, X, 61, 8 which is therefore naturally called one of the





Of speech that which is 'yes' and which is 'no',  
That which is harsh<sup>6</sup> and that which is immense,  
Laying aside<sup>7</sup> have poets found their quest,  
They, bound by names,<sup>8</sup> rejoiced in the revealed || 3 ||

In which<sup>9</sup> revealed the poets did rejoice,  
In it in unity the gods exist,  
'Casting aside all evil by this lore,'<sup>10</sup>  
The wise one rises to the world of heaven || 4 ||

Neither by name of woman<sup>11</sup> is he called,  
Nor yet by name of neither man nor woman,  
Nor yet by name of man may he be named  
By him who fain would tell the name of breath || 5 ||

*Brahman* is called 'a' and the 'I' is there contained<sup>12</sup> This is produced as a thousand *brhasis*. Of this produced as a thousand *brhasis* there are thirty-six thousand syllables. So many are the thousands of the days of man's life. By the syllable of life<sup>13</sup> alone does he obtain the day of life, and by the day of life the syllable of life. There is a chariot of the gods which destroys desires<sup>14</sup>. Its seat

<sup>6</sup> Sayana cites Taittiriya Āranyaka, IV, 27 (Ānandaśrama ed., p. 333) *āhat pādaḥ yahi chandāḥ bhindāḥ bandhāḥ āha ita vacaḥ āvraṇaḥ*; ulkhastris he renders *akrośādikam*. Cf. also Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XIV, 24, 2, Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p. 266, 1 ed. *Myth*, III, 366.

<sup>7</sup> *tejasya* like *nama* in ver. 4 appears 'metrical'.

<sup>8</sup> This merely means they rose above mere names to the unity of *brahman* or *prana*. Sayana renders 'dependent on the letter 'a' which is the name of *prana*'. Anandatirtha refers to the names of Bhṛgusvant.

<sup>9</sup> *nama* is rendered by Sayana as equivalent to *namayastāḥ* above. This cannot be the case, nor can it well be for *namas* as Ānandatirtha construes it. It must be for *noma* the last a being lengthened *metre causa*. For such cases cf. Macdonell *Indic Grammar* p. 62, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* || 437. Sāṅkhyaśāstra Sūtra XVII 9 7, XVIII, 22 10, even in prose (cf. *Intro.*, p. 70) *J A O S*, XLV, 98, below, III, 1, 2, n. 2.

<sup>10</sup> By the help of *brahman* is Sayana's version and so also Anandatirtha takes it. More probably it is by aid of this doctrine. For *apahatya*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 1, 10, 2.

<sup>11</sup> Sayana quotes Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, V, 10 (the late metre is noteworthy) —

*naiva stri na jman ita naura sayam napumśakah |  
yamāc charāram dāṭte tena tena sa evāyāc ||*

For the nominative, cf. passages like Bhṛgudevatā, V, 39 where I would read *Īśāpatih* with MSS. h. d., Rgveda Prāśasthya, VIII, 26, Taittiriya Saṃhitā V 7, 4, 4, &c.

<sup>12</sup> This must be taken as a clear assertion that *brahman* includes the individual self. Sayana says it refers to Hiraṇyagarbha quoting the very late Vāspottīyāratiṣaṇīya Upaniṣad, V *śarvāhamāṇas Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ* |

<sup>13</sup> Ānandatirtha explains the *adāra* as the female form of *Varuṇ*, the *adāra* (we) as the male. As a matter of fact the sentence merely asserts he obtains *brahman* or *prana* by means of *brahman* or *prana* as both are revealed in the syllable and the ritual of the Mahāvratā day, as in I, 2, 2.

<sup>14</sup> Sayana explains this as a chariot of Hiraṇyagarbha. Anandatirtha renders *anaktima*

in speech, its two sides the ears, the horses the eyes, the driver the mind. Breath mounts upon it. A Rṣi says (RV, X, 39, 12), 'Come hither on what is quicker than mind,' and (RV, VIII, 73, 2), 'On what is quicker than the winking of an eye'."

#### ADHYĀYA 4.

In the beginning<sup>1</sup> the one self was this, there was nothing else blinking. He<sup>2</sup> thought, 'Shall I create worlds?' He created these worlds, water, light,

*mdrah* as, '*Prāna* has no desires and delights in *Mayā*' i.e. Rāmā. Really all that is meant is that there is a chariot, viz. the body, where *prāna* mounts as contained above in the verses. Anandaśrīha explains the *udāhi* as *Pamā* in snake form *brove* as *Candra* and his wife, *jaśrat* as *Candra* and his wife, *cat* = *i* as *Surya* and his wife, *manah* as *Rudra*. The metaphor is not rare, e.g. 3, quotation in *Āvalāyana Śānta Sūtra* VI, 5, 3, *Śākhāyana Āranyaka*, I, 8, RV, III, 14, 7, as interpreted by Leisgauer (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 170) where the prayer is a chariot, *Atharvaveda* VIII, 8, 22, where *udāhi* and *jaśrat* also occur, and are rendered as above by Whitney, *Matrīyāni Samhitā*, III, 4, 4, *Kāṣhaka Samhitā*, VII, 8.

<sup>1</sup> Śrīyana adds a long digression (cf. Max Müller, *S B E*, I, 235, 236) on the difference of this *pranavādyā* from that of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* and the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, in which *prāna* is not related to the *Mahāvratā* ceremony. Following as usual Śākhara he also discusses what is the result of this *pranavādyā*, and concludes that it leads after death and absorption in the *paramātman* to rebirth as the *brahmaleka* where after enjoyment of all the powers of a deity, he proceeds to obtain full knowledge and *mukti*. But Śākhara ignores the fact that *mukti* is not as yet known to this *Āranyaka*, which in its philosophic doctrine reaches only the unity of existence and the identity of the self and *brahman* and which promises immortality, not liberation, to the devout. It is impossible even to say that this *Āranyaka*, II, 1-3, realises clearly the doctrine that *ātman* is consciousness, though it approaches this standpoint. It does not assert that the self is unknowable as pure subject or the unreality of existence, as is done by the later Upaniṣads and the Vedānta. To the writer of this Upaniṣad immortality meant a continuance of conscious existence, because the identity of the self and the world did not involve in any way the destruction of self. All that it involved was the destruction of what is really self from its accidents. It is of course true that this position is not strictly consistent, but it is no more unsatisfactory than that of Vedāntism.

<sup>2</sup> Śākhara, Anandaśrīha, and Sayana all expend great efforts in explaining this short Upaniṣad, II, 4-6, but they mainly deal with difficulties which do not arise if no effort is made to reconcile this text with pure Vedāntism or to explain logically its inconsistencies. The real advance on II, 1-3, consists in (1) the fact that *ātman* is the subject, not as before *prāna*, *puṛuṣa*, (2) that *ātman* and *brahman* are more explicitly recognized as intelligence, but both these points are foreshadowed in II, 1-3. Max Müller (*S B E*, I, 236) leans to the view that this Upaniṣad rises from the conception of life to that of the self, but this is rather too great a distinction. This Upaniṣad is a little more advanced than II, 1-3 but not much so. Deussen (*Sechzig Upaniṣads*), of course, interprets it as a later Upaniṣad and reads into it doctrines not contained in it. Colebrooke (*Essays*, I, 47-53), Roer (*Trans.*, pp. 26-34), and S. Sitarāma (*Upaniṣads* V, 1-64) follow Śākhara. On *udam*, cf. Max Müller, *S B E*, XI, xix. Bohlingk has rendered the Upaniṣad, *Sichis Ber.*, 1890 p. 161, cf. 1891, p. 85, 1897, p. 9. For Rāmānuja's interpretation, cf. *S B E*, XLVIII, 71, 81, 201, 205, 391, 417, 451, &c. <sup>3</sup> This is an imitation of the *Purusa Sūkta* RV, X, 90, cf. Taittiriya *Āranyaka* III, 12, but, as Deussen points out with the essential difference that the metaphysical *pruṣa* of the *purusa* is the *ātman*. The view of the relation of the *ātman* to the world is cosmogonic,

mortal, and waters. This water is above the<sup>3</sup> heaven, and heaven supports it. The lights are the sky. The mortal is the earth, those under the earth are the waters. He thought, 'There are these worlds. Shall I create guardians of the world?' He formed the person,<sup>4</sup> taking him out from the waters.<sup>5</sup> He brooded<sup>6</sup> on him, and when he was brooded over, a mouth burst forth as an egg does. From the mouth came speech, from speech fire. Nostrils burst forth. From the nostrils came forth scent,<sup>7</sup> from scent wind. Eyes burst forth. From the eyes came forth sight, from sight the sun. Ears burst forth. From the ears came forth hearing, from hearing the quarters.<sup>8</sup> Skin burst forth. From the skin came forth hairs, from hairs plants and trees. The heart burst forth. From the heart came forth mind, from mind the moon. The navel burst forth. From the navel came forth down-breathing,<sup>9</sup> from down-breathing death. The generative organ burst forth. From the organ came forth seed, from seed water.

not pantheistic. Of course the orthodox view of the commentators that the *alma* is the *Īvara*, not *Īrāyā*, and the creation is *adhyaropa* from II, 4, 1, to II, 4, 3. This is not, it is admitted by Sayana clear from the text, but he appeals to Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad, IV, 10, *mayam ita prakṛtiṃ vidyad*, and Brāhma Sūtra, I, 4, 23, *prakṛtiḥ ca pratyakṣāḥ deśāntaraṃ roḍhāt* besides other passages equally irrelevant. In Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 1, *astakṛta* the regular form occurs. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa often has unsugmented nouns, see p. 36, Rohlfsing, *Sachs Ber* 1900, II 433. The next clause, here and II, 4, 3, may be interrogative or merely an expression of determination (so commentators and translators). For *apar*, cf. Atharvaveda VI, 23, 1, *Ind Stud*, X, 440, n. 1, *J A O S*, XXV, 110.

<sup>2</sup> The translation of Max Müller, 'and it is heaven,' can hardly be right, and it is not supported by the commentators. It is true that heaven must come in somewhere, for it is sufficient if it comes in as a support, and so Rohlfsing and Deussen, with Colebrooke, Sitarāma, Rājārāma, and Roer take it. Anandātīrtha explains *amūḥa* as *makha* and the other worlds beyond the heaven where the waters were originally placed, 'the blue firmament,' Rājārāma.

<sup>3</sup> This is the later *varṇa* of the Vedānta. Anandātīrtha calls it Brahman, in accordance with the Viṣṇu legend. Cf. Hopkins, *Rel of India*, pp. 230 sq.

<sup>4</sup> The five elements (Sayana), Brahman, &c. (Anandātīrtha).

<sup>5</sup> The sense of *atapa*, to create by will, is pointed out by Śāṅkara, who (cf. Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt* I, 87 sq, 91 sq, Oldenberg *Religion des Veda* pp. 402 sq) cites Mūṇḍaka Upaniṣad, I, 1, 9 *yajñaḥ jñānamāyamaṃ tapas*! The translation here is borrowed from Max Müller (cf. also *S B E*, LV, 28, n. 2). For *yathānāṣa* below, cf. Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa III, 14, 8, Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, II 13. There are sets of three, the organ, the activity and the natural phenomenon corresponding which is later called the presiding deity. See e.g. the Anugītī, Mbh, XIV, 1119 sq. For this *astakṛta*, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad VI, 2. Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, II, 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Prāṇa* here means clearly the power of smell. Originally (1) it meant the breath in the widest sense from which it came to denote (2) life or the 'quintessence' of conscious life, as frequently in II, 1-3. On the other hand, (3) it was narrowed down to denote one of five *prāṇas*, II, 3, 3 and these *prāṇas* were contrasted with *manas* and the *indriyas*, though in death or sleep the fundamental character of the *prāṇas* came out. (4) The sense 'smell' is an independent and not very common development. (5) Another development applies it to all the organs of life, e.g. eyes, nose, tongue see I, 3, 7, n. 6. Cf. *Sāṅkhya Aranyaka*, p. 11, n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> Anandātīrtha explains them as Jodra, Yama, Varuna, and Kubera.

<sup>8</sup> *Ajāna* here has the other meaning of down-breathing, not inspiration, but breathing.

2 These deities<sup>1</sup> being created fell into this great ocean<sup>2</sup> He troubled him with hunger and thirst. The deities spake to him, 'Grant us a place, where we can rest and eat food' He led a cow<sup>3</sup> for them They said, 'This is not enough for us.' He led a horse for them They said, 'This is not enough' He led man<sup>4</sup> to them. They said, 'Well done!'<sup>5</sup> Man is indeed well done He said to them, 'I enter according to your places.'<sup>6</sup> Then fire,<sup>7</sup> having become speech, entered the mouth Air, having become scent, entered the nostrils The sun, having become sight, entered the eyes The quarters, having become hearing, entered the ears The plants and trees, having become hairs, entered the skin The moon, having become mind, entered the heart Death, having become down-breathing, entered the navel The waters, having become seed, entered the generative organ Hunger and thirst said to him, 'Grant us two a place' He said to them, 'To these deities I assign you, I make you sharers

of wind in the lower part of the body Cf on II, 3, 3 and II, 4, 3 Rājārāma takes it as 'air inhaled by mouth, not through nostrils' Colebrooke has 'the air drawn in by deglutition', explaining that swallowing was considered a parallel to inhaling Cf Z D M G, LV, 261, LV1, 156, J A O S LVII, 249

<sup>1</sup> This section really reverses the former section There *atman* produced the worlds then *purusa* and the deities. The deities now enter into *purusa*. Compare the common process in the Brahmanas where the *brahman* creates the world and then enters it, but here the deities have no creative power and the section only seems to show the reciprocal dependence (cf Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt.*, I, 218, 219) of the deities and the senses of the great cosmic forces and the microcosm I take the subject of action to be the *atman* throughout, so do Śāṅkara and Śrīvaṇa. Poir apparently takes *purusa* as subject of all save the first two sentences. Colebrooke apparently read *akhyarchan* and so makes the *atman* alone subject and object in the sentences.

<sup>2</sup> This must mean the ocean of being, from which *purusa* is evolved. Sayana says into the *svaya*, but this seems less probable The *v* below *alanayoparisa* is the form in the Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad while in Ta it nya Aranyaka IV, 23, *alanaya sa gīṣa ca* is found Cf Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII 13 *alanayoparisa*, Aufrecht, p 431, Bobblingk *Sachs Ber.*, 1900 p 418

<sup>3</sup> Because it has no upper teeth says Sayana. He is, however, right in quoting II, 3, 2, as showing the real reason for the preference of man, as the most intelligent

<sup>4</sup> The commentators Ānandatītha and Sayana who often follows him Colebrooke, followed by Roder Max Müller and Deussen explain this *purusa* as different from though allied to the *purusa* of II, 4, 1 This hardly seems likely and the confusion of thought is just as great on the former theory as on the latter The exact parallelism with II, 4, 1, of what follows is against their view For the particle *iv* cf P A O S, Apr 1893 pp 21 22

<sup>5</sup> Śāṅkara suggests it may mean 'self made' (cf Max Müller's trans. (S B E LV, 58) of Ta it nya Upaniṣad II 7) because man is created by his own illusion, or that he is the 'abode of all good actions', which S Śārāma in his trans accepts Max Müller (S B E, LV, 20, n 4) equates *sva*<sup>8</sup> and *svārta* as = deeds performed by oneself and believed to be good

<sup>6</sup> Cf Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa I 18, 3, which may be borrowed

<sup>7</sup> This means Sayana says that in the absence of the deity the faculties cannot work He quotes Brahma Sūtra, II 4 14 *pratyakṣa adhi dhanam tadātmam* I Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa II 11 12 seems not unrecurrent of this passage

in them<sup>1</sup> Therefore to whatever deity an oblation is offered, hunger and thirst are partners in it<sup>2</sup>

3 He thought, 'There are these worlds and the guardians of these worlds Shall I create food for them?' He brooded over the waters<sup>3</sup> From the waters brooded over form<sup>4</sup> was born The form that was born was indeed food The food when created sought to go away<sup>5</sup> He was fain to seize it He sought to grasp it with speech He could not grasp it with speech Had he been able to grasp it with speech, man would have enjoyed food by uttering its name alone He sought to grasp it by scent<sup>6</sup> He could not grasp it by scent Had he been able to grasp it by scent, man would have enjoyed food by scenting it alone He sought to grasp it by the eye He could not grasp it by the eye Had he been able to grasp it by the eye, man would have enjoyed food by seeing it alone He sought to grasp it by the ear He could not grasp it by the ear Had he been able to grasp it by the ear, man would have enjoyed food by hearing it alone He sought to grasp it by the skin He could not grasp it by the skin Had he been able to grasp it by the skin, man would have enjoyed food by touching it only He sought to grasp it by the mind He could not grasp it by the mind Had he been able to grasp it by the mind, man would have enjoyed food by thinking of it alone He sought to grasp it by the generative organ He could not grasp it by that organ Had he been able to grasp it

<sup>1</sup> Sayana following Anandaturtha, explains that as hunger is mitigated by the knowledge of its (i.e. food's) proximity, or by hearing of it, so the senses all appease hunger and thirst Sankara's view is that the sensations become eaters by sharing in the deities i.e. fire, &c., in the body and in the world, so they share in every offering to a deity (i.e. the deity and the worshipper both eat)

<sup>2</sup> The five elements (Sankara and Sayana)

<sup>3</sup> Form or organism, as Rajarama translates it, is natural, not something imposed on matter, and it plays no such part in Indian thought as in Greek Even the Buddhist *rūpa* is not a pregnant conception

<sup>4</sup> Roer reads *madat*, 'crying' so Rajarama, and see next note. Sankara explains 'that mice &c. try to run away from ants that eat them He takes *apghamsat* as it sought to run away,' and this is followed by Sayana and Anandaturtha and by Visvesvaranatha, besides being accepted by Colcbrooke Roer, 3 Sitarama, and Rajarama, Max Muller, and Deussen But that this is correct seems very unlikely Rather it may mean, 'He sought to strike, grasp it' which idea is later developed in detail This leaves the exact sense of *parat* difficult If it is neuter of Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1117, Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana I, 2, 4, 6, 1, Katha Upanishad, II, 4, 1, Mauryaniya Upanishad, VI, 17, Orléans, J A O S, XVI, 126 But if it is m no purpose (cf. Atareya Brahmana, III, 46, 2, Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana I, 2, 4) a tolerable sense is made as masculine But I prefer Bohlingk's *atyapghamsat*, cf. Roth, *Z D M G*, LXIII, 106-111 If *emat* is nom., cf. Introil, p. 56 In Manava Gilya Sutra, I, 17, 5, occurs *athaman dadhimadhu samahamsat*, which Knauer (p. xlii) defends by quoting the Atareya Brahmana passage (VII, 22) and Kandiriki Brahmana XVII, 1, and by the fact that *na* in Pali occurs on the nom (cf. Muller *Pali Grammar*, p. 88) Lohtlingk, *Sachs Ber.*, 1896 II, 155, 1900, pp. 418, 418, decides the use

<sup>5</sup> As above in II, 4, 1 For a rather similar lat., cf. Jaiminiya Upanishad Brahmana I, 60

by that organ, man would have enjoyed food by sending it forth alone. He sought to grasp it by down breathing. He obtained it.<sup>5</sup> Thus it is Vāyu who lays hold of food, and Vāyu is he who lives by food.<sup>6</sup> He thought, 'How can this be without me?' He thought, 'By which way<sup>7</sup> shall I enter?' He thought, 'If speech distinguishes, if scent smells, if the eye sees, if the ear hears, if the skin feels, if the mind thinks, if down breathing digests, if the organ sends forth, what then am I?' Having split open the top of the skull he entered by that door. That door is called *rudrā*, the place of happiness.<sup>8</sup> There are three<sup>9</sup> dwelling places of him, three dreams, this dwelling place, and this, and this. Born he looked through all beings, to see whether any one wished to proclaim

<sup>5</sup> *Vāyu* is derived from *ayati*. The use of this causal form is confined to this sense but is found both in Sāṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa. The sense is perhaps 'consumed' rather than 'seized'. Possibly a *ref* is the source (Monier Williams' *Dict.*), but this is less likely, cf. *J A O S*, LVII, 83, *Ind. Stud.* XLIII, 24.

<sup>6</sup> Or he who gives life by food, as Savana and Ānandātītha take it, quoting Tīrthadaranyaka Upaniṣad II 2:1 *annam dāma*, IV, 3 6, and *Āśvatthi* Upaniṣad, III 2:1 *āyana* describes the passage as *ānandānāma*. For the long series of conditionals, cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 950. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 366, Speyer, *Indische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 195. These cases are all normal: they refer to a past unreal condition for the act of creation is not conceived as continuous, and correspond to the Latin pluperfect subject or the Greek aorist indic. in protasis with *de* with aorist in apodosis. The form *agrahaḥ yat* is remarkable cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VI 24 *parajagrahāsam*, ibid., 35 *pratyajagrahāsam*, and see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 904 b 1069 a for other cases of the anomaly.<sup>7</sup> The *Supanādhya* also contains the form *agrahāsam* Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, xxiii see *Mantrapāṭha* II, 8, 3 *agrahāsam* cf. Böhtlingk, *Z D V G*, LIV, 517, with Bloomfield, ibid., LVIII 127 *J A O S* LVI 135.

<sup>8</sup> Śaṅkara illustrates by the metaphor: Unless the lord the city keep, the watchers watch in vain. There must be the soul in the body. Śāyana compares Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad III, 4:1. Contrast with Aristotle, *De Anim.*, III, 5 is interesting.

<sup>9</sup> I.e. by the tip of the foot as in II 2:4 or the skull. Śāyana connects the former with the *harmendriyas* the latter with the *jñānendriyas*. Ānandātītha refers to a variant in Śaṅkara's commentary *an* or for *atā*. It obviously must have been wrong but it is worth noting that Śaṅkara's text was not very complete or certain. It is noteworthy that here we have no hint of *karman* (cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad III 2, 13 sq., IV, 4 3 5).

<sup>10</sup> So called because connected with *hara*, says Ānandātītha. The *Jaiminīya* Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa knows a *nāndāna saman* and *Sāmaveda*, II 651, a *nāndāna stoma*.

<sup>11</sup> These three are variously interpreted. Śaṅkara gives two explanations. The first is that of right eye inner mind and ether in the heart. Ānandātītha explains the mind as in the throat, and identifies the heart with the ether. He thus gets in his own commentary the triad right eye throat, and heart, and so Colebrooke. Śāyana as often follows him rather than Śaṅkara, and after him cites the *Isaṇa* Upaniṣad III *netre jagrahāsam rudrāḥ kaniḥ troṣṭam samā d'et i sūtanāḥ ārdraṣyaḥ* (cf. *ārdraṣṭhā*).<sup>12</sup> Śaṅkara and the others explain the states as of waking dreaming and deep sleep for all are sleep as compared with true knowledge of *brahman* (cf. *Āyalya* Upaniṣad, XII). The other explanation is that referring to another birth viz. one's own body and those of one's mother and father, this is no doubt quite wrong but Śāyana reconciles the two theories by assigning two kinds of *samskāra*, *dīnasya* *vāṭra* and *jānendriya-vāṭra* to which the theories correspond.

another self<sup>11</sup> He saw this person only as the most widely extended *brahman*<sup>12</sup> I have seen it, so he said. Therefore he was Idandra by name, he was indeed

✓ <sup>11</sup> Sankara does not explain this passage. Ānandātīrtha says that either he regarded it as clear or his copyists (cf n 8) omitted it. His own explanation gives us a choice. (1) He identified himself with creatures because he did not see the true self, *āt* being used in the sense of *yama*, or simply, he identified himself with creatures: he did not see the true self, *āt* marking the close of the *adhyarupa* section. (2) The *adhyarupa* ends with *atasaṁśa* *āt*, and with *sa jata* begins the *apamaṇa*. He examined the creatures separately, whether they had *svatā* *satta* or not, and concluded that 'there is nothing that I can call different from the true self'. *Vadīyama* is given for *avadīyat*. Sayana follows this one of Ānandātīrtha's explanations, using some of the actual words. Colebrooke has, 'What else (but him) can I here affirm (to exist)?' S Sūtrama reads 'How should he speak of any other?' and Roer has, 'How could he desire to declare any other thing different from him?' Rājarama, 'Can any (element) here call (the ruler) different?' Max Müller and Deussen render, 'whether anything wished to proclaim here another self.' This must be right, or perhaps the subject should be 'any person', the difference is, however, slight. This version is supported by Ānandātīrtha in his own commentary, *īha bhūtesu anyam matā 'nyam pratartakam avadīyat kim vadet*, says Visnu. *Vadīyat* cannot refer to the subject of *adīryakhyat* and *anyam* must refer to *ātmanam*. *Vadīyat* may be an intensive aor subj, or the juncture of a *desid* from the intensive, both rare forms (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, II 1019, 1023). Nilakantha thinks this passage is referred to in the Moksadharma Mbb, XII, 10060, no doubt wrongly, see Deussen's trans, p. 493. For *adīryakhyat*, *adīryakhyat* should certainly be read. The confusion between *āhy* and *āt* is very frequent in all sorts of MSS., cf Weber, *Ind Stud*, IV, 273, Hillebrandt's notes on Sankhyasra Sūtra, IV, 12, 10, 15, 1, Gobhila, *Grihya Sūtra*, I, 3 18 (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXX, 21), Knauer, *Nanava Grhya Sūtra*, p. xxv. Scheffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen der Rgveda* pp 174, 175, and at great length in his forthcoming work, *Zur Stammbildung*, &c, on *kṛichra*, *Z D M G*, L. 42. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 126, *Ēpigr Ind*, IV, 122, *prakhyaṭītam* for *praksatītam*. The Nruktā, III, 20, already recognizes it and uses it in connecting *ākhyā* with *ākṣa*. On the other hand T, a South Indian MS, has the correct *āsāt* though perhaps only by conjecture. Rājarama gives the form as Vedic for *adīryakhyat*, and no doubt a confused remembrance of such a form may have helped to keep the absurdity in the text when once it had forced its way in. *Vadīyat* he gives as *let* of *śvad*. For *ātma* he accepts the etymology from *āt*, the 'motor' or 'vital force'. Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 116, 117) adopts the etymology of Weber and Garbs (*Die Samkhya Philosophie*, p. 293) of *ātman* from *āt* and so denoting (1) the wandering wind, (2) the *samsarin* soul, whence come the other meanings, person, self, body, nature. It is quite possible that the root and the wind were deemed to be closely connected—there are plenty of parallels—but of course in this case we cannot take *samsarin* in the technical sense. The more usual derivation is from *śam* (Roth), while Deussen (*Allg. Gesch. der Phil*, I, 1, 285 sq.) prefers to derive *ātman* from two pronominal stems. No explanation as yet offered is satisfactory, since none explains Vedic *imama*, &c (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 61). Bobhtingh's conj *anta dīyat*, 'to see if it referred to any one save himself,' is good, but not essential.

<sup>12</sup> The commentators all read *brahman* separately, and though the sense would be much the same this is better than to take *brahmatatamam* (with || text) as one word. The commentators and translators all agree it is for *tatatamam*, and Deussen compares *dūrnasprapataram* in Chandogya Upaniṣad, V, 10, 6. We may also compare *nabhamam* (= *nabhamam*) according to Max Müller in RV, V, 27, 3, see Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 412. *Varunavayvitamam* for *\*vatamam* = V, 3, 2, though there the Jaiminya Upaniṣad Brahmana, I, 10, 1, reads *fari*.



Idamdra by name. Him who is Idamdra they call Indra<sup>13</sup> mysteriously. For the gods love mystery<sup>14</sup>

### ADHYĀYA 5

In man<sup>1</sup> he is from the first as a germ<sup>2</sup>. That seed is strength gathered from all the limbs and he thus bears a self in his self. When he connects the seed to the woman, then he causes it to be born. That is his first birth. The seed becomes the self of the woman like one of her own limbs. Therefore it hurts her not. She nourishes the self he has given her there. She, as nourisher, is to be nourished. The woman bears the germ. The man before the birth of the child and thereafter<sup>3</sup> supports him. When he supports the child before its birth and

*gataṇam*, and for a large number of somewhat similar (but often doubtful) cases Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 290, II, 2, 128, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 38, 49. Bloomfield, *P A S*, April, 1893, p. xxxv, *A J P*, XLII, 416-418. Otherwise it might be translated 'just that' in accordance with Panini, V, 3, 93 for which see Bhāgarata Parāśara, V, 26, 28 is also cited, so Bohtlingk, and in Chandogya, I c, \**taṇa* is now read.

<sup>13</sup> For Indra as a designation of *ātman* cf. II, 3, 2, n. 2. For *adāritam*, Lévi, p. 107.

<sup>14</sup> The phrase here occurs in *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 43, 1. *aty ā aksate parokṣam parokṣatam ā detuḥ*, a similar but characteristically slightly different phrase occurs repeatedly in *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* VI 1, but not in I 1, Weber, *Ind Stud.*, XIII, 268, V, 127. Cf. also *Āitareya Upaniṣad*, IV, 2, 2, where Indra is mysteriously called *Indha* as the person in the right eye, for the same reason as here. Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 161) happily compares the riddles found in the *Rigveda*, the *Atharvaveda*, and the *Yajurveda*. The gods require amusement as well as reverence. So also the gods must have animals to play with (Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 148, Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 74, and Keith *J R A S*, 1907, p. 936). Other examples of obscenity are *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, VI, 1, 2, 2, VII, 8, 1, 22 (Winternitz, p. 177). Cf. also Winternitz, *Monistapathos* I, xux, 2. Śaṅkara sums up the result of this chapter in an interesting and polemic discussion of the *ātman* as eternal and unthinkable subject (U pp. 50-64 trans. by S. Sitaśāstra, pp. 39-49), but what he says bears rather on his system than on the Upaniṣad. See also Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 38, n. 6.

<sup>1</sup> Śaṅkara following Śaṅkara thus sums up the result of the Upaniṣad in the introduction to this *Adhyāya*. There is (1) *brahman* undeveloped and truly real, (2) then *adhyātma* in (a) the fourteen worlds in *brahman*'s egg (b) *viraj* who regards the worlds as his body, (c) the *śatruyas* arising in his body, (d) the *preṇḍa* deities (e) the subjects of the *śatruyas* including man, (f) the food of the deities and its appropriation, (g) the three states of the self, (3) the *apavīda* beginning with *ajāta* and ending with the end of II 4, 3. This sect on takes up as regards other births than the present the question of the three states of the soul. This section seems to be referred to in the *Mahābhārata*, VII, 113, 10662, m. 19494. Cf. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, VI 2, 2, 2. Lévi, p. 107. For the egg, cf. Gomperz, *Greek Philology* I 93.

<sup>2</sup> This simple and easy narrative should not, of course, be explained by the *pañcāṅga* as Śaṅkara proposes, but is much earlier in conception. *Ānandabīṇa* explains the whole as a question of the different manifestations of *ātman*. The odd except *Śatruyas* and *U* and *Rājāśra* punctuate at *refus*, but the *compar* and the *parallelism* *ad et ad* are in favour of the other punctuation. The sense is the same. Bohtlingk's *compar* (= *diver nam*) is not essential.

<sup>3</sup> The commentators here differ. Śaṅkara and *Ānandabīṇa* in his *śāṅk* take (1) *janmano* 'pre' as 'before birth', (2) *agra eva* as *pātmantram*, (3) *adha* as 'after birth'. This seems preferable, except that *agra eva* must be considered as explained by *janmano* 'pre'. *Ānandabīṇa* in his *śāṅk* explains (1) as above; (2) as *agryat*, *śatruyas* *agryat*, (3) *adha* as

thereafter, he supports in truth himself, for the continuation of these worlds.<sup>4</sup> For thus are these worlds continued. This is his second birth. This self<sup>5</sup> is appointed for holy deeds. The other self having done its duty and attained old age departs, and departing hence is born again. This is his third birth.<sup>6</sup> A poet says (RV, IV, 27, 1), 'Within the womb, I learned all the races of these gods. A hundred brazen forts restrained me, but like a hawk I escaped swiftly downward.'<sup>7</sup> Vāmadeva lying in the womb thus declared this. Knowing this, he

*aśhakatama*. Śāyana renders (1) *agra* etc. as *prasaśat* *prag* *eva*, (2) *janmano* 'gre as *prasaśat* *andhānu*, (3) *odhi* = *adhikata* *tama*, apparently borrowing this from *Ānandatīrtha*'s *bhōgya*. The services before and after birth which Rājarama Ramakṛṣṇa Bhāgavata alone recognizes, as apparently also Colebrooke, are explained as the mourning the mother and performing the usual ceremonies before and after birth. It is just possible, however, that *adhikata* *odhi* is the verb, and the reference is only to what is done before birth. Böhlingk omits *agra* *cva*.

<sup>4</sup> Contrast the late and elaborate passage in Kausitaki Upaniṣad, II, 15. The passage, Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, III, 11, is fundamentally different.

<sup>5</sup> That is the son. The following passage is quoted by Śaṅkara on *Dhāradānyaka Upaniṣad*, p. 307.

<sup>6</sup> Śaṅkara explains that as father and son are one *ātman* (cf. V, 3, 3), the three births are correct. Śāyana says either (1) the *ātman* being one, it has three births, two as son, one as father, or (2) the two births of the son have analogues in the case of the father and that of the father in the case of the son, so that each has three births. The third birth is taken by the commentators as rebirth in heaven, hell, or in the world of men. Probably, as there is no proof that the Upaniṣad knows the doctrine of transmigration, it refers to being born in the next world, an idea familiar in the Brahmanas (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 168, 169, *Sanskrit Literature* pp. 223, 224) which differs essentially from transmigration, i.e. birth into this world again, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 294, 295, E. T., pp. 325 ff. Levi, pp. 96 n. 1, 97, n. 1, Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, II, 8, contra Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 288, Böhlingk, *Sachs. Ber.*, 1893, p. 92. For *vyaya* *gate*, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 190.

<sup>7</sup> This verse is very obscure in this connexion. Śaṅkara, Ānandatīrtha, and Śāyana all explain it as referring to the innumerable bodies through which Vāmadeva had passed until he obtained *mukhi* through knowledge. This meaning cannot be got from the passage. The context seems to show that it only means that Vāmadeva knew the three births of *ātman*, and so escaped and became immortal. The doctrine of *mukhi* is not apparently known to the writer of the Upaniṣad. If it were, it would be made clear. For the meaning of the verse in the original of Bergaigne, *Rel. Ved.*, III, 322. Eggeking *S. B. E.*, XXVI, xi, p. 1, Roth *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVI, 353, Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 282, and especially Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 124, who explains the myth as referring to Agni. When the cloud is rent in the storm, the lightning (= *īyena*) breaks from the cloud and simultaneously the Soma flows upon the earth. Sayana in his *Rgvedic commentary* follows this passage. On RV, IV, 26, 1, Śāyana says that Vāmadeva, who had in his mother's womb the knowledge of Brahman, sets forth that knowledge of the identity of himself and Brahman, in the verses *aham* *Ātman*, &c. (so Śatapatha Brahmana, IV, 4, 2, 21 and 22). So [Śāyana] on *Atharvaveda*, XVIII, 3, 15 *as khalu garbhavartha eva somo upanmatatrayāṇaḥ stvayā sarvadyajam annasamiddham*. Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, pp. 76 ff.) holds, no doubt rightly that the idea is not found in the RV passage, but no conclusion as to the priority of the Śatapatha Brahmana, I c, can of course be drawn from the fact that no mention is there made of the legend, which may quite well have been known to the Śatapatha, though not referred to. His version

*brahman*,<sup>6</sup> Indra, Prājapati, all the gods, the five great elements,<sup>7</sup> earth, air, ether, water, lights, all these and those which are mixed with small as it were,<sup>8</sup> seeds of various kinds, born of eggs, born from the womb, born from heat,<sup>9</sup> born from germs,<sup>10</sup> horses, cows, men, elephants, and all that breathes, whether it walks or

*atistayāna, vundhāyāna, prakṛtistayāna, aviprakṛtistayāna, darīana, dhārana, manā prāṇānāṁ tatātvaṁ maitā, brahmasūyam itātam, sarvapravāna, sarveṇa dehābhāsa svarūpeṇ ca samam ramate, sarvabhūta, sarvabhūtvam āsana amṛtananda vātanātrāta* Sayana borrows from both, he refers *samyak* to *samyak*, *medha* to *grāhakatadarthakāṣṭhānam*, *jaṭā* to *jaṭus* or as in Śaṅkara, *senikāṣṭhā* to *asemicāṣṭhā* 'pe vadunt samyaktvaṁ kālpanam', for the rest he follows faithfully Śaṅkara. *Tajajama* renders 'consciousness, direction, sagacity, intelligence, retentive power, understanding, courage, power of thinking, freedom of thought, intrepidity, memory, will, capacity, vitality, ambition, obedience' Lehtlingk makes these subjects and *prajñatmetram* predicate

⑥ This may fairly be construed as an assertion of the pre-eminence of knowledge. The parallel passage in the Kausitaki Upaniṣad, III, is clearly later for it combines elaborately the doctrine of *prajñā* (see II, 1-3 above) and that of *prajñā*. The relations cannot be reversed.

\* Possibly masculine as Śaṅkara Anandātīrtha, and Sayana think, followed by Colebrooke, Roer, Śhāraṅga, Rajarāma, Max Müller, Böhtlingk, and Deussen. But this is not necessary nor likely in view of the notes below, and *Brahman (m)* is not found as a deity in the *Āitareya Brahmana* (but only as priest, p. 68). The occurrence in *Maitrayani Samhita* II 9, 1, is interpolated v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 91, n. 1. *Mou Sansk. Texts* V, 323, finds the masc. in various Śatapatha passages, unnecessarily. But it occurs, e.g. in *Kausitaki Upaniṣad*, I, 3. The masc. is natural and is helped by the following case.

\* This passage is relied on by Deussen (op. cit. p. 168, E. T., pp. 185, 186) in support of his view (accepted by Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 217 sq., and Winternitz *Gesch. der indisch. Lit.* I, 208) of the lateness of the *Āitareya Upaniṣad*. But there is nothing in the expression itself to demand a late date, and the fact that the version in the Upaniṣad of the creation is so detailed instead of being a proof of lateness, may rather be considered a sign of early date, when the creation still was considered a veil act and the doctrine of the omnipresence of *brahman* as consciousness was not so fully developed. The passages *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* I, 4, 7, *Chandogya Upaniṣad*, VI 1, 3 both contain a reference to name and form, a conception familiar to Buddhism but not apparently at all early. The *Taittiriya*, II, 6, is evidently a mere résumé of a well known doctrine. But that Upaniṣad bears conspicuous traces of lateness: indeed it already quotes Ślokas very often and becomes quasi-metrical while it knows the *Atharvanguṇas* (II, 3) and has a much developed theory of the *āśas* of *ātman*. For the elements (*akāśa* = empty space) see Böhtlingk, *Sachs. Ber.* 1900 pp. 149-151. Keith *J. R. A. S.*, 1909 July.

\* Mixed with small (Śaṅkara). *For* he calls meaningless. Cf I, 1, 2 n. 3 III 2 6. Mixed from smaller portions (of the former) is Roer's version, which is no doubt the sense. The others of various sorts are opposed to the great elements. Colebrooke has 'joined with minute objects and other seeds'.

\* Śaṅkara explains as *yukadīna* which Anandātīrtha accepts. Sayana renders *krīmīdānaśādiṇi*. The word does not occur in the *Chandogya Upaniṣad* VI, 3 1, but it is impossible to accept that as a valid proof of later date since such lists (cf those of the *prajñā*, I, 3 7, 4 1) vary enormously in the same book. In *śarajam*, cf *śara*, *Jaiminīya Brahmana* II, 430, 6 (*J. A. O. S.* XIX 100), Böhtlingk's *śarajam* is not necessary. For a similar list of *Anugata*, *Mbh.*, XIV, 1124.

\* Rendered by Śaṅkara *vrkṣādīna*, by Anandātīrtha *bhūvaṁ mānuṣa jātāni vrkṣādīna*, and by Sayana *taruṇīmadīna*. Rajarāma has 'shoot born'. The form is normal and is not a case

You are the two pans<sup>2</sup> of the Veda May my lore forsake<sup>3</sup> me not. I join day and night with what I have learned I will proclaim the real, I will proclaim the true<sup>4</sup> May this protect me, may this protect the teacher. May it protect me, may it protect the teacher

*tanish* is a conjecture of his the text MSS. in I, 4, 4 have either *vanash* or *vans*, while, ibid 8, all save one (*vanash*) have *vans*. Only one Paddhati (cf p 19) has *vanim*, obviously an error for *vanash* (which of course (cf V, 1, 6, n 4) is the Sandhi of *vans ash*), if it is not a mere misreading of the MS. There is thus no real support for *tanish* (how exactly Dr Knauer would take it, I am not sure), and in the Manava Gbhya Sutra the simple Sandhi *matara* for *me + atara* is actually found in I, 3, 2 (so also I, 9, 11 *vastarasi*<sup>5</sup>, I, 11, 16 *vastuda*, &c, see Knauer, p. xxxix). Probably *vans* lead to the more intelligible (to the scribe) *vans*.

For *vans*, &c, Knauer, who does not notice the Atareya passage quotes Paraskara Gbhya Sutra, I, 3, 25, Taittiriya Samhita, V, 5, 9, 2, Taittiriya Aranyaka (Audhra text), X, 72, Atharvaveda, XIX, 60, 1. There is also the parallel version in Sankhayana Aranyaka, VII, 1, where *vedanamattarash* takes the place of *vedarya*, &c. This may perhaps mean 'hidden in', but probably we have a mere corruption, see my translation. The Mantras are no doubt old enough Colebrooke, who comments on the use of Mantra as applicable to part of an Upanishad, renders, 'May my speech be founded on understanding, and my mind be attentive to my utterance.'

<sup>1</sup> *Ananyasamartha*, Sayana. Colebrooke renders, 'For my sake (O speech and mind!) approach this Veda,' perhaps reading *manu*. Dr Schellertowitz takes it as 'navel'. The word in the Rigveda, I, 35, 6, &c (cf Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 39), seems to refer to the pin of the axle of a cart, and the metaphor is natural enough, cf Leumann, *Et Wort* p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> *prahash* may be a second person, or a problematic third person based on a false analogy (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 889, Webet, *Berl Satz*, 1895, p. 830), or an error for *prahant*. Precisely the same difference of reading occurs in Khila, IV, 8, 5, *bruidan me mād prā hant*, where Peterson's MS has *hasit* and cf Manava Śranta Sutra II 1 2, 36 (*hasit*) with Taittiriya Samhita, III, 1 3, 2 (*hasit*), in the same phrase, *dikse ma ma hasit(h)*, and in Hiranyakeśi Gbhya Sutra, I, 6, 20, 1 *yathasat* for *yathasat* (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXV, 189). Schellertowitz renders 'das von mir Gehörte möge man nicht verspotten vermittels des Erlernten,' taking *hasit* from *√has*. The long *a* would be unusual,<sup>6</sup> but in any case a derivation from *√ha* seems preferable in point of sense and is supported by Atharvaveda, VI, 41 3, Taittiriya Aranyaka, IV, 42 (Anandakrama ed., pp. 352, 353). The translation will be literally 'O lore, forsake me not,' reading *frata* perhaps as the nom. is unusual, and the neuter voc. is perfectly well supported (cf Delbuck, *Altindische Syntax* § 66), and the reading *frata me* is easily corrupted into *frutam me*, cf Lanman's note on Whitney, *Atharva Veda*, XVIII, 2 3, Whitney, *P A O S*, Oct, 1887, § xxv, and my note in *J R A S*, 1907, p. 225, although the nominative can stand cf Winternitz, *Monistopäthe*, I, p. xvii.<sup>7</sup> For the sense cf Atharvaveda, I, 1, 4, Taittiriya Upanishad, I, 4, 2.

<sup>3</sup> From here to the end this is identical with the Taittiriya Upanishad, Śāksavalī, I, 1, or Taittiriya Aranyaka, VII, 1, 1. The sense of *alavatra* is no doubt, 'I work all day and night,' as Sayana takes it. Colebrooke renders, 'Day and night may I behold this, which I have studied.' In III, 1, 2, the next is used.

<sup>4</sup> Compare, however, *sakye* which Whitney, no doubt rightly, reads in Atharvaveda, II, 27, 5 although the form elsewhere is always *sakye*, and III, 1, 6, n 5 *ahant*, given as only grammatical by Whitney (*Roots*, etc., p. 203), is found in the Dakṣamaracanta (Bühler, *Ind Ant*, XXIII, 147).

<sup>5</sup> See also my note in *J R A S*, 1908, pp. 1124-31.

## ĀRANYAKA III

## ADHYAYA I

NXT comes the Upaniṣad of the Samhitā text. The former half<sup>1</sup> is the earth, the latter half the heaven, their union the air, says Māndūkeya. The union is the ether,<sup>2</sup> so proclaimed Maksavya. 'For it is not considered independent,' and so I do not agree with his (Mānduka's) son,' he said. 'They are alike' and it is considered independent,' said Āgastya, for the air and the ether are both alike. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. 'The former half is speech, the latter half the mind, their union is the breath,' so said Śuravira Māndūkeya. Then said his eldest son. 'The former half is mind, the latter half is speech. For by mind one first resolves and then utters speech. Therefore is mind the first half, speech the second half, and truth their union.' It is indeed alike<sup>3</sup> with both father and son. This compact of mind, speech, breath, is like a chariot<sup>4</sup> with three horses. He who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame,

<sup>1</sup> e g in *Agnim ile m is gurvarāpam ī uttararāpam*, and m: Samhitā (Sāyana). For all this Aranyaka cf. Śāukhyāna Āranyaka, VII, VIII, printed in Appendix, and my translation, pp. 41-56.

<sup>2</sup> *Ākasa* is rendered 'void' by Böhtlingk in his translations of Chandogya and Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣads see II 6, m ? contra Whitney *P A*, Oct 1890, p. liii.

<sup>3</sup> This is not at all easy. *Ākasa* (like *śukla*, II 1, 3, 8) seems to be passive because it is difficult to make out a translation either as *nīkītatam* (Sāyana) or *manyā* (Anandatīrtha). The subject must be *vajras*, and the sense must be as in Sāyana (cf. Śāukara on Taittiriya Upaniṣad III 10, 4; Max Müller, *S B E* VI 63 n. 1) that *vajras* is included in *ākasa* and therefore is inferior to it. Anandatīrtha takes *gubhna* as referring to the fact that *ākasa* is the father of *vajras*. The subsequent identification he explains on the ground that *vajras* is the stronger. In Taittiriya Upaniṣad I 3 the earth, sky, ether (= *anānāṣa* & *śāklara*) and *vajras* are given as the four factors. *Ākasa* is obscure. It may be a gen. dat. and refer to Māndūkeya or possibly a vague reference (cf. *Rigveda Prātilikhyas* I, 2) to the subject, helped by such genitives as that in V, 3, 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Samana* is next, probably because *mate* is understood, or perhaps it is *ferm*. The solution is that the two views are equally correct, because in *upāsande* it is not things but words that are considered (Sāyana). Anandatīrtha rightly takes the last words as giving the opinion of Mahātareya. Otherwise they must be Āgastya's in which he concurs. Max Müller reads as *S ceti* but it is not in B or the other MSS and it is merely a misunderstanding of the commentator.

<sup>5</sup> They gave a similar result, and so are alike and equally justifiable, *no hy upāśande taitītatam apēkate*. For *manas* and *var*, see Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 39, 31.

<sup>6</sup> *Vajras* is made the subject by Anandatīrtha. The real subject is clearly the meditation on the Samhitā. For three horses, cf. RV I 39 6 100, 17, VI 47 24, VIII 7, 28. The metaphor recurs constantly in different forms in Sanskrit literature e g Mbh, VI, 1477 sq. The analogy with the *Phœbus*, 246, is obvious. For *samhitā* cf. RV, III, 1, 7, Geldner, *Vedische Studien* I 164.

<sup>7</sup> Anandatīrtha renders the children as *prajāna*, and the cattle as *vedas*. Sāyana with

glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days. So teach the Māndūkeyas.\*

2 Then comes (the teaching) of Śākalya.<sup>1</sup> The first half is the earth, the second half the sky, their union is rain, Parjanya is the uniter. Thus it is when he rains strongly and continuously for day and night, then people say, 'Earth and heaven have united'. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self.

Śākara regards this Upaniṣad as intended for persons who are neither fit for *mukha* (II, 4-6) nor even for union with *Huanyagarbha* (II, 1-3).

\* This section gives us the views of certain Māndūkeyas. The *śān* *lukayas* occur in Rgveda Prātiśākhya, § 200, and in the Purāṇa tradition (Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, II, 100 sq., III, 253). Schiefelowlitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, p. 12, has revived the theory that certain of the *śān* *lukayas* represent parts of their Samhita, but cf. Oldenberg's review, *Götting. Anz.*, 1907, pp. 218 sq., and my review, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 226 sq. The word Upaniṣad in this section clearly means 'secret doctrine'. This is certainly the earliest sense of the word (denied, no doubt, from teaching in the forest, which was done for the sake of secrecy, cf. *Introd.*, p. 15). I cannot accept Deussen's view (*Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 13 sq.) that the earliest sense was 'secret word' (a case like *rajjalan*, &c.), then 'secret text', then 'secret sense' of a ritual action. The earliest sense may well have been 'secret meaning' of a ritual action whence it seems to me the other meanings are very easily derived. Deussen's theory is bound up with his view of the *śāstrīyas* as propounders of a secret lore, as to which cf. *Introd.*, pp. 50 sq., III, 2, 6, n. 11. I agree with Deussen, however, and with Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I 209, n.) in re-asserting Oldenberg's view (*Z. D. M. G.*, L, 458 sq.) of Upaniṣad as *upāsana*. See, however, also *Z. D. M. G.*, LII, 70 sq., and Max Müller's view in 1869 *Rigveda Prātiśākhya*, p. 12, Hopkins, *Act. of Ind. A.* p. 218.

A muddled version of this section occurs in the Rgveda Prātiśākhya, I, 2, 3. *Madhukyaḥ samhitāḥ svayam āha tathakālam cāya. Madhukya eva samanadam anile cambare ca madhukyaḥ svayam tad eva || 2 || 3 || adhyatmakṛtāḥ Śvaratrah tūlā\* ca vanmanasir vrodantya dnuṣṭṛāḥ || sandhāḥ tveerānam mṛdhujam tadanti laudhākaraccaranam ca pratnam || 3 ||* See Max Müller, pp. 11-12. The Śākhayana has, VII, 2, an attempt at an improved version, reading in one MS *śarīkṛtāḥ* in both cases. Dobthigk, in the smaller *Dist.*, I, 130 renders *svīparīkṛtā* as 'identical' but this makes no sense. The reference in the Prātiśākhya is of course valuable as giving Śaunaka's date as a *terminus ad quem* for the latest date of the Āraṇyaka.

<sup>1</sup> It refers to the case of *śa* *yan* acc. Panini VI, 6 37, 1 n. where vowels like *a* become *y* before *a*. A fourth party is introduced. Śākalya must of course be the great grammarian to whom the Samhitā is ascribed, and this gives us not a very ancient date for this Upaniṣad but it need not have been written long after Śākalya. Rather it seems to be early. For Śākalya's date see *Introd.*, p. 71. He must probably go back to 700 B.C. Geldner (*Indische Studien*, III, 144 sq.) considers that Śākalya must be identical with Vāgdeha Śākalya mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa VI 6, 3, XII, 6 9 (see Weber, *Ind. Stud.* IX, 277 sq., *Indian Literature*, p. 33) and identified with the maker of the *paṭasṭhā* by the Vāya Purāṇa, LX 5<sup>4</sup>. He was therefore a contemporary of Āruṇi and Vāyavalkya in opposition to Oldenberg's view (*Dravidiana*, pp. 371 sq.) which refers him to the end of the Brāhmaṇa period.<sup>2</sup> Weber (l.c.) thinks that *Śākalya* in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III 43 5, refers to his school, but the

\* *śūlā* which is wrong in fact, illustrates the inaccuracy of the reproduction.

<sup>2</sup> Geldner evidently takes a much more respectful view of the antiquity of these ages than I would. I think it quite possible to hold that Śākalya and they belong alike to the end of the Brāhmaṇa period. On the other hand I think Hroele's dating (*Or. et. Ind.*, pp. 106 sq.) wrong, see *Z. D. M. G.*, 1908 pp. 229, 230. *J. R. A. S.*, 1908 p. 264.

Every man is egg-like,<sup>2</sup> there are two halves, they say;<sup>3</sup> this is the earth, this is the heaven, and between them is the ether, just as there is the ether between earth and heaven. In this ether<sup>4</sup> the breath is fixed, as is the air in that ether.

reference is too far fetched to be worth consideration—indeed such comparisons hinder rather than aid progress. The evidence of the Vāya Purāṇa is worthless. Identifications are easy and obvious, and we cannot tell that we have a piece of tradition at all. The fact that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa does follow the rule of Śakalya (Panini VI, 1, 118), that *a* before *r* becomes *ṛ* and that *a* may remain, cannot prove that Śakalya is prior to it. The reverse may be the case. As Geldner admits, the RV.—and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is in the same position—do not follow his rule (VI, 1, 127) as to *ī* & *ē* before dissimilar vowels, and we are left with grave doubts whether Geldner's view that Śakalya was merely to Panini the author of the *paṭiśāṭha* and author of the Pratiśāṭhya is sound. The fact therefore remains that when Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 46, recognizes *śāyama uttīkī* as the pronunciation, it cannot have before it Śakalya's text, unless we admit (which is too bold) that the Sāmhitā is later than Śakalya. I prefer therefore, Oldenberg's date of Śakalya, and I would lay stress on the fact that in the Aranyaka he is Śāyama Śakalya<sup>5</sup> in the Brāhmaṇa Vīdagdhā. These names are too distinct to permit of identification. The Śakalya of the Pratiśāṭhya is likewise Śāyama and must be the same as the man here.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Andam* (later *andā*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 171, Macdonell, *Pedie Grammar*, p. 33, n. 14) *andapadīram tarna-tīrat chandasah* (Sāyana). The neut. is not worthy as comparatively rare in Sanskrit. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 13 *ārpanam ha du kīta*, also II, 3, 3, *madhyam atma* &c. Parallels are common in Greek and Latin (*ova dyōdū voluciparū* Monto, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 166, *malum mela videtur* (est) *mors* Cicero, *Thuc.* I, 3, 9). The use is thus substantival rather than adjectival as is clearly felt in the case of *madhyam*. See also the striking case, Bhādarāyana Upaniṣad, I, 4, 3 *idam t idam ardhairgalim ita roah* (so Böhtlingk, *Chrestomathie*, p. 357, Max Müller, *S B E*, VI, 85, n. 2). In *it* *an* there is a lengthening sound also in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa in prose (Aufrecht, p. 477) with *it* also. Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 372, II, 3, 8, n. 9.

<sup>2</sup> 'They say' can hardly refer to the following words, as Max Müller takes it, though this is partly supported by the last words of the section.

<sup>3</sup> *Tasmin hasmin* is certainly curious. The Śākhayana parallel VII, 3, 11 is a correction and throws no light. The MS. evidence is strong and Ānandātītha renders it as *tasmin ha smim*. Perhaps *smim* stands for *asmin* (cf. Müller *Pali Grammar*, p. 24) and *ha* is the particle. No root or base *ha* exists from which *hasmin* could naturally be formed. Sāyana ignores the point and may possibly have read *tasmin asmin* as does Rajendralala, but this is unlikely. The correction *hasmin* leaves the error unexplained. It is to be noted that in the Sunahśepa legend, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VII, 13 the MSS. read *it ha sma aty iya* which Aufrecht keeps in the text and gives (p. 431) as one of the grammatical errors of the Brāhmaṇa. The parallel Śākhāyana text has merely *it*. Böhtlingk in his *Chrestomathie*, p. 351 and *Sachs Ber.* 1900, p. 418, amends to *hasma* and claims that Sāyana bears this out. But Sāyana's note while showing that he took *sma* as equivalent to *asma* is not conclusive though it tends to show that he had *asma* before him, just as he seems to have read *tasmin asmin* here but arguments from his silence are dangerous. He ignores *smasmas* in II, 3, 7. I do not think it impossible that this *smim* and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa's *sma* are parallel phenomena of an attempted simplification of

<sup>4</sup> It is true Śāyama does not occur in III, 1, 2, but I do not think it is reasonable to take the Śakalya of that passage as different from him of III, 2, 1, 6, as does e.g. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 50.

<sup>5</sup> On *ha* see Max Müller *Kg vā Pratiśāṭhya* pp. 7-11.

Just as there are those three lights in heaven, so there are these three lights in man. As there is in heaven the sun, so there is the eye in the head. As there is in the sky the lightning, so there is the heart in the body. As there is the fire in earth, ■ there is the seed in the member. Having thus represented the whole world as the self, he said, 'This is the symbol of the earth, this of the heaven'. He who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days<sup>1</sup>.

3 Then come the reciters<sup>2</sup> of the Nurbhaja. The Nurbhaja dwells on earth the Pratrna in heaven, the Ubhayamantarena in the sky. Then if one should rebuke him who recites the Nurbhaja, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two lower places'<sup>3</sup>. If one should rebuke him who recites the Pratrna, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two upper places'. But there is no rebuking him who repeats the Ubhayamantarena<sup>4</sup>. For when he unites the words, that is the Nurbhaja form,<sup>5</sup> when he pronounces the two syllables pure, that is the Pratrna form. This is the first. By the Ubhayamantarena both are fulfilled

the forms of the base a. Possibly the production of such forms may be due to the analogy of *adamin* (RV) and of *sar at* (Chandogya Upanisad). Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 495 fin. See however, also Böhtlingk's remarks in his *Grammat Abhandlungen im Aitareya brahmana*, Leipzig 1900, where he regards the irregularities noted by Aufrecht I ■ as due to misreadings of the text and I fully recognize that undue reverence to such texts is absurd. On the other hand old forms do disappear and of perhaps the use of *ima* and *imanam*. Mallikarjuni Upanisad VI 7 II 6 and the Vedic *imama* (Panini VI 4 141. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 61). There is also the elision of *a* in *manu* Mantrapittha I 13 9 (= Hiranyakeśi Gbha Sūtra I 16 3) see Winternitz edition I xxvii. Wackernagel I, 318.

<sup>1</sup> These sections 1 and 2 may be compared with Taṭṭirya Upanisad I 3 which treats the *saṃhita* with reference to the spaces (earth heaven ether wind) lights (fire sun water, lightning) knowledge (teacher, pupil knowledge training) generation (mother father child begetting) and the self (lower jawbone upper jawbone speech tongue). This elaborate system must be later than the Aranyaka. Cf. Max Müller *Āgveda Pratiśāhya* pp. iii sq.

<sup>2</sup> Or recitations of. The Nurbhaja is the *Samhita* the Pratrna the *Paṭha* and Ubhayamantarena the *Krama Pāṭha*. Max Müller (see his *Āgveda Pratiśāhya* p. 11 and *Lectures*, p. 11) first pointed out the importance of this passage. Cf. also Oldenberg *S. B. E.*, LVII 145 sq. *Prolegomena* p. 180. Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature* p. 58. It is summarized in *Pratiśāhya* I 4. see my *Sinhāyama Aranyaka* p. 45 n. 3. III 1 2 n. 8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ayo śarīśarāhāyana* is clearly a case of irregular Sandhi cf. Atharvaveda IX, 1 1 *prīṣṭyāntīśarīś* III 3 4 n. 11. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 316 317. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* pp. 64 65. *J. A. O. S.* LVII 99-103.

<sup>4</sup> It is the perfect form, e.g. Sayana says in the *Samhita* in *ayam* 1 2 the *ī* = *stāvita* + *prātis* in the *Paṭha* they are both *anvīta* (cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 90, Macdonell *Vedic Grammar* p. 72 n. 7).

<sup>5</sup> Sayana explains *nirḍa* (as *ānṛpāntīraṇa pūruttara a'dau yatim*). Max Müller thinks it may refer to the arms of the words being cut off as it were or with two arms stretched out the two words forming as it were two arms to one body. In the following *ayo śarīś* is clearly the reading though S and R in the commentary vary reading *ayo śarīś* and *ayo śa*. The *Sinhāyama Aranyaka*, VII 8, has the correct form.



He who desires proper food should recite the Nirbhuya, he who desires heaven should recite the Prātina, and he who desires both should recite the Ubhaya-mantarena. Then if another should rebuke him who recites the Nirbhuya, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the earth, the deity. The earth, the deity, will strike thee.' If another should rebuke him who recites the Prātina, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended heaven, the deity. The heaven, the deity, will strike thee.' If another should rebuke him who recites the Ubhaya-mantarena, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the sky, the deity. The sky, the deity, will strike thee.' Whatever he says to him<sup>1</sup> or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled. But to a Brahmin one must not say anything save what is auspicious. Only in exceeding<sup>2</sup> prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin. 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,' says Śrāvira Māndukeya.

4 Then come the imprecations<sup>3</sup>. Let him know that breath<sup>4</sup> is the beam. If any one rebuke him who has become breath in the beam, then if he thinks himself strong<sup>5</sup> he says, 'I have grasped the beam, breath, thou canst not overcome me who grasp the beam, breath. Let him then say, 'The beam, breath,

<sup>1</sup> *bruvan ta bruvanām va*. This may perhaps be taken as I have taken it as equivalent to 'whether he speak to him or speak in reply'. This is quite a simple construction. But it is not so taken by the commentators. Sayana renders *bruvan* as equivalent to *bruvanām*, and takes the second part as *va abruvanām*. This is followed by Max Müller. Anandakīrtiśa interprets it as *bruvan vā abruvan ta bruvanām va abruvanām ta*. For similar curses, cf. Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka VII 10 and Chandogya Upaniṣad II 23 3.

<sup>2</sup> Sayana takes this as permitting a curse on a Brahmin in the case of great wealth (such wealth being sinful). Anandaśiṣa denies this and carries on the negative. Thus Śrāvira's dictum confirms this. This is less probable. Max Müller accepts Sayana's view that the man is to say 'Let them be known to Brahmins'. It is simpler to take it as in the text: *For na cāna of V, 3 3* Delbrück *Altindische Syntax* pp 544 sq., Channing *J A O S* XIII xviii. Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa II 77 (*J A O S* LV 240) *na te śarīraṇa cāna grāham grihīyanti* and Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV 14 5. The rule that *na* precedes seems true for the Brāhmaṇa prose.

The two accs. with *brū* (for *brū* cf. Bloomfield *A J P*, V 180, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I 182; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* p 36) are said by Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax* p 174 cf. Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* p 8; Gieddke, *Der Accusativ im Veda* p 265) not to be found in the Brāhmaṇa language, which this passage disproves. *Brū* is expressly mentioned as governing two accusatives in the Kāṇḍa cited by the Kaṭhaka Vṛtti in Patañjali I, 4 51, where a much more marked case than that here (where the second acc. is merely a pronoun) is adduced, viz. *manasāham dharmam brūis*.

<sup>3</sup> Sayana takes this as a noun of agency like *mādhujaprasādak* in III 1, 3. Anandakīrtiśa says *aimano jñānasya mārthyaśāntarānākti prabāva ucyanta ite śeṣaḥ*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Śākalya's view, III, 1 2. The metaphor is from house building. The opt. below is clearly indefinite (like the subj. in Latin and opt. in Greek), see III 2 1, 2 2 and see my note on the Kaṭhaka *J N A S*, 1909. For *vaṁśa* see Zimmer *Alt Leb.* p. 150.

<sup>5</sup> The construction is curiously changed below to the accusative unless, in possible, the other person is meant. But see *St Petersburg Est s v man* 3. The nominative is,

will forsake thee' But if he thinks himself weak, he should say to him, 'Thou hast not been able to overcome he who have been fain<sup>a</sup> to grasp the beam, breath. Breath, the beam, will forsake thee' Whatever he says to him or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled. But to a Brahmin one must not say anything except what is auspicious. Only in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin. 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,' so says Śuravira Māndūkya.<sup>b</sup>

■ Now the reciters of the Nirbhūja say, 'The former syllable is the former half, the latter the latter half. The space between the former half and the latter half is the union'. He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days. Now Hrasva Māndūkya says, 'We that recite the Nirbhūja say that the former syllable is the former half and the latter syllable the latter half, but that the union<sup>1</sup> is the space between the former and latter halves in so far as thereby one produces the union and distinguishes accented and unaccented and separates the mora and what is not'. He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days. Now his son,

however, quite regular, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 268, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* §§ 308 and 39. Cf also the idiom *krino* (acc) *rupam* *kr* (Taittiriya Samhita, V, 2, 6, 6. VI, 1, 3, 1, 6. 5, 2, 4, 1, 4. 7, 1, VII, 1, 6, 2, 3. 4. Brahmana, I, 1, 3. 3, Aitareya Brahmana, VI 38 see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XII, 111). The construction with the nom (cf Delbrück, *Vedische Syntax*, pp 104 sq. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 33) is no doubt rare in later Sanskrit, but I have found it in an independent passage in Anaśatirītha and the analogous use of the gerund is found in the Ramayana, &c. Cf the curious phrase, Manu VIII, 91 *eko 'ham amsyī āmanam manyase*. *Chakrasam* in Rajendralāla is merely an assimilated & altered into *anusvara*. The error of B in reading *chakrasam* shows how little dependence can be put on this MS. As to *ala* cf III, 2, 4 & 10. *Evam* is here in apposition to *pranam* but I agree with Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 136, that the strict rule (Bohlingk *Z D M G*, XLII 182) cannot be proved for Vedic or Sanskrit.

<sup>a</sup> *Samadhisantam* is of course the const. indie. of the desiderative of the root *dha*. Max Müller translates *samadhisantam* as a participle, but this is impossible. Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1035, *Revist*, &c., p 249, f A O S, XIII, lxx.

<sup>b</sup> These cases are just intelligible, but the cases in Śākhāyana Āranyaka, VII, 8 and 9 offer serious difficulties. As the text stands the first case is that of rebuking another, when if strong the rebuker (this must be the subject) says to the other, 'Thou hast grasped the beam or beam but canst not overcome me who am fain,' if weak, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not'. In the second case the sense must be (reading *paraṁ* of making *paraṁ* mean 'the subject' & 'the man' & 'me', 'he' & 'man' who holds 'that' & 'grasp' & 'want' & 'can' & 'rejoice', 'I have been fain to grasp the beam, breath, thou canst not overcome one who is fain,' if the rebuker is strong. If not, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not.' Other renderings are quite possible and the text can be altered (e.g. read *samadham* in VII 8), but it is not possible to be certain of the sense, see my trans., pp 44-46.

<sup>1</sup> i.e. this view is differentiated in one or two points from the view above. Cf Śākhāyana Āranyaka, VII, 21-23.

Madhyama, his son by his wife Pratibodhi,<sup>1</sup> says, 'One pronounces these syllables by their letters, neither separating entirely nor uniting absolutely,'<sup>2</sup> and the mora which is between the former and latter halves and indicates the union = the sliding. I consider therefore the sliding to be the union.' A Rū says this also (RV, II, 23, 16), 'O Brhaspati, they know nought higher than the sliding.' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days.

¶ Tarukya<sup>3</sup> says, 'The union is formed by the Brhat and Rathantara Sāmans. The Rathantara is speech, the Brhat breath.'<sup>4</sup> By these two, speech and breath, the

<sup>1</sup> *Metronymics* like this were inevitable where polygamy was possible. They do not prove matrarchy or anything similar. A similar instance is the famous *hṛna* Derakṣputra of Chandogya Upaniṣad III, 17 (not ? as in Max Müller) 6, who is the subject of an interesting discussion in Garbe's translation of the *Bhagwadgītā*, and cf. *J R A S.* 1907, pp. 975 sq., 1908 p. 173, n. See also Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 169. A child sometimes, if illegitimate, was named after its mother, e.g. Satyālīma Jabala, Chandogya Upaniṣad, IV, 4. For a long list of metronymics of a curious character see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 4, 30-32. The reading of B is a mere error in an inaccurate NS. Max Müller suggests Pratibodhi as the correct form, and this seems the form in the Sāṅkhayana. For the *ī*, cf. however Macdonell, *Pāṇini Grammar*, p. 75. Pratibodhi is a recognized name in the Gāṇa *śāstra*. For other metronymics of Fleet *J R A S.* 1905 pp. 637, 638, Hopkins, *J A O S.* XIII, 105, 370, n. 1; for a discussion of matrarchy as affecting the Aryan Hellenes, see Farnell, *Archaeol. of Religions* *wissenschaft*, 1904, pp. 70 sq. and passim.

<sup>2</sup> The reading is clearly *anekikṛtan*. *Ehikṛtan* is an easy but bad blunder. Sayana explains that you must not (1) pronounce *tan* as *tan+st* nor (2) as *tanst*, but (3) as *tanst*. This cannot be meant. It is really intended that you should pronounce so as to give a sound of *st* together. Compare the fact that in the so-called elision of Latin both elements were distinctly preserved in pronunciation (cf. Lindsay *Latin Language* p. 144), as in modern Spanish. Cf. also Deussen *Seiching Upaniṣads* p. 214. This passage is of particular interest in confirming the notice in the *Āgveda* Pratiśākhya III, 8 (200) (Max Müller's edit., p. 127) that Mandūkya laid down the use of the circumflex in the Pratiśā Sandhi (e.g. *a+e*, &c.) as well as in the Abhisandhi Sandhi (*e* or *e+a*), and the exceptional cases of *i+e*, in which the circumflex is regularly laid down and the fact that the *a* is not merely elided generally recognized by the Pratiśākhya (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 324, Macdonell, *Pāṇini Grammar*, p. 104). So *Āśā* VIII, 2, 6, has *svanto vānānti padidā*, and see Wackernagel, I, 292-293, Macdonell, p. 104. The requirement of the circumflex is only intelligible on the *anekikṛtan* theory.

The form *anekikṛtan* is interesting. *Fls+akr* is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1093 and contrast III, 2, 3. *asthā* *akṛtyan*, *ekikṛ* occurs in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad IV, 4, 2 in the sense of dying, and cf. Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S F E.* XV, xlii) *tanā ekikṛtaḥ parasmai*, cf. also Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 168. For RV, II, 23, 16, cf. Geldner, *Falsche Studien*, III 68.

<sup>3</sup> Tārūkyā is more probable than Tārūkyā because the alteration to Tārūkyā is natural, the word occurring above on I, 5, 2. Possibly Tārūkyā is merely a case of *svarabhaṭi* cf. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 50 sq. It is clear that Sayana read Tārūkyā as he derives it from Tārūka. The *Ānandabrahma* corrects it into Tārūka without warrant. The Śākhāyana *Āraṇyaka*, VII 19 has Tārūka, cf. *Amṛtali Brāhmaṇa*, XXV, 9.

<sup>4</sup> These Sāmans are used in the Pratiśā Mōtra of the *Āgṇi* *śoma*.

union is made' Tarukṣya guards<sup>3</sup> (his teacher's) cows for a year for the sake of this Upaniṣad. For it alone does Tarukṣya guard the cows for a year. AṚṣi says (RV A, 181, 1, 2), 'Vasistha bore hither the Rathantara, Dharadvaja carried hither the Brhat of Agni'<sup>4</sup>. He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days. Kauntharavya says 'Speech is united with breath, breath with the blowing air, the air with the All gods, the All-gods with the world of heaven, the world of heaven with *brahman*. This is the gradual union'. He, who knows this gradual union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven, just as does this union. If he for the sake of another or for his own sake recites (the union) let him know as he is about to recite,<sup>5</sup> that this union has gone up to heaven,

<sup>3</sup> This is a quaint piece of human nature. There are plenty of parallels of Chandogya Upaniṣad, IV, 4. The omission of the second sentence in B is clearly a slip, showing how untrustworthy is the MS when uncorroborated. For the *anustupajambhū*, cf. Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad, I, 3. 2. Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 177, 4. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 92. Geidner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 33 n) finds such a loc in RV, I, 6. 9 *śānu amūm rīṣya gīrah Rakṣayati* is a hist. pres. The middle here gives clearly the idea of personal interest (cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 166 b, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 236 sq.). For the hist. pres. cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 302, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 172, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 117, Brugmann *Griech. Gramm.*, § 156, and especially his paper, *Berichte der Königl. Preuss. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1883, pp. 169 sq., Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 247. The present tense essentially denotes what is continuous or progressive (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, pp. 62-63) as opposed to the momentary, and that whether the verb has the sense of an action or a state. The historic use with a particle of time is Homeric, but not the simple historic present though it is found in the earliest Latin (e.g. the epitaph of Lucius Cornelius Scipio (B.C. 193) *cepit, immitit omne(m) Lusitanum optulisse abdonat*) and must be Indo-European.

The acc. of time is common, see *Introd.*, p. 56, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 170, 171, Gaedicke, *Der Aitastav im Veda*, pp. 175 sq., Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 18, Hopkins, *A J P.*, XXIV, 7.

<sup>4</sup> These Sīmans are required to accompany the important Pravargya. Cf. *ṣaṣṭi Saṅkhyāyama Aranyaka*, p. 48, n. 6.

<sup>5</sup> *abhiyāśrayam* is an extraordinary form. Whitney, *J A O S.*, XIII, 122, takes it as an acc. ind. but I cannot make sense of this. To take it as at first seems most natural as a mistake for a future participle (*āśrayam*) is faced with the difficulty that *āśr* gives only *āśray* as the future in accordance with the established rule (Pāṇi I, VII. 2. 70) that roots in *r* take intermediate *s* (Max Müller, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 332), and that even if *āśr* were assumed *āśr* would need explanation though *s* and *ṣ* are constantly confused in MSS (e.g. *śrāṣṭyam* and *śrāṣṭam*, *Mantrajam Samhita*, IV, p. 138, Whitney, *P A O S.*, Oct., 1837, p. 225, *accipiam* and *accusam*, *Chandogya Upaniṣad*, I, 11, 2, Whitney, *P A O S.*, Oct., 1890, p. 111, *nīṣṭama* and *nīṣṭama*, *Aitareya Brahmana*, VII, 16, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brahmana*, p. 431, above I, 1, 5), *apṛakṣyaś* and *apṛakṣaś*, *Chandogya Upaniṣad* Max Müller, *S E E.*, XV, xiv, n. 1, Knauer *Atomica Gṛhya Sūtra*, p. 225, and occasional longs are formed, e.g. in *sakṣye*, *Atharvaveda*, II, 27, 2, for *sakṣye*, &c., *asakṣi* (Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 887). There remains only to take *abhiyāśrayam* as an aorist participle (without of course any past sense), 'while reciting,' cf. e.g. RV, II, 4. 7 *ādhāt ad vṛtīm*. But such forms are also very

and that so it will be with those who know it (and become) gods. So will it come to pass. He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days. Pañcalacanda<sup>4</sup> says, 'The union is speech'. 'By speech are the Vedas composed, by speech the metres. By speech friends are united, by speech all beings, therefore = speech all this'. Now<sup>5</sup> when one repeats or speaks, breath = in speech, speech then swallows breath. When one is silent or in sleep, speech is in breath, breath then swallows speech. They swallow each other. Speech indeed is the mother, breath the son. A Rṣi says (RV, X, 219, 4), 'There is one bird,' he enters the sky, he sees this whole world, with ripe mind I beheld him nigh = hand; the mother absorbs him, and he the mother'. He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days.

note The form *abdhakryote* in *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (= *abdhakryaṣṭi*) may be explained perhaps by the cases of irregular lengthening above, and by the (Epic) use of middle terminations for active (*J A O S*, XXV, 132), rather than as a causative passive as in the Dict. In *Atharvaveda* XVIII 2, 38 the editions both read *vidhaktām* and the pseudo-Saṃyana apparently so read though he renders by *uḥan*, but the parallel passages, RV, X, 16, 7 and *Taittiriya Āraṇyaka*, VI, 1, 4 have both the correct *vidhakyām* (Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 846), and the accent proves clearly that *vidhaktām* is incorrect. Macdonell (*Vedic Grammar*, p. 87 n. 1) suggests that in the case of *yokte*, *vidhaktām*, *sakṣe*, *muktām*, the *y* has dropped phonetically, cf. *J A O S*, XLV, 147.

*śafat taṭha syat* might of course mean, 'may it ever endure' (as taken by Max Müller), but the usual use of the phrase in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* supports the rendering above adopted, e.g. II, 21, 2 *ya enam tatva brūṣṭā vaca vajrena yajamanāya granam syagat prama anam ājyatis śafat taṭha syat*, 22, 3, 23, 2 3 39 7, IV, 7, 7, VI 23, 15, 26, 6, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 343 n. 1 (for the construction with *śafat* there mentioned, cf. *Saṅkhyāna Āraṇyaka* I, 8). Eggeling on *Saṭapatha Brāhmaṇa*, V, 4, 3, 2 (*S B A.*, XLI, 98, n. 2), now adopts 'wobl' as the regular equivalent of *śafat* at any rate in the *Brāhmaṇas*, and see also Oertel's note on *Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, I, 54, 3. Saṃyana takes *śafat* as a part of the protasis. In any case the sense is very much the same.

*sa* or *sa yad* is of course not a particle but the demonstrative. The cases in which Max Müller (*S B E*, XV, 110, n. 7 on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, II, 4, 7) and Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 215, 216), following the *St Petersburg Dict*, find *sa* = a particle are merely instances of an ordinary anacoluthon, and do not prove that *sa* was ever felt as a particle. Precisely the same *khon* is common in early English and no one there thinks of 'he' as a particle, see Kellner, *English Syntax*, pp. 68 sq. Correct Caland, *Über des Rg Sutra des Baudhāyana* p. 46.

<sup>4</sup> Pañcalacanda must mean Candā (no doubt Prākṛit for Candra, cf. *Atharvaveda*, II, 14, 1 (Cāṇḍā)) of the Pañcālas, as Saṃyana takes it. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII, 23, knows a *ling*, Darmakha Pañcāla.

<sup>5</sup> This is the proof of the nature of speech as other than and distinct from breath. Their activities are different. *Aṅyo'nyam* is very interesting as already it tends to become a separate word, though it still is here two words, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 321 sq.

<sup>6</sup> This verse is more unconstrued even than usual. He enters the sky, it is said, as wind, the world he sees as *pram*, he is seen close in the heart (Saṃyana). On the *√rā* of the RV verse cf. Hopkins, *J A O S*, XXVIII, 125 sq.

Then comes the Prajāpati union.<sup>9</sup> The first half is the wife, the latter half is the husband. The union is the son. The act of union is the begetting. This union = Aditi. For Aditi is ■ whatever there is, father, mother, child and begetting. A Rś<sup>10</sup> says this also (RV, I, 89, 10), 'Aditi = mother, = father, = son'. He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven.<sup>11</sup> He lives out ■ his days.

## ADHYAYA 2

Śhivira Śakalya says that breath is a beam,<sup>1</sup> and that as the other beams rest on the main beam of the house, the eye, the ear, the mind, the speech, the senses,

<sup>9</sup> Proclaimed by Prajāpati (Sayana), but see Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka VII 16. Cf. Taittiriya Upaniṣad, I, 3 8, and on III 1, 2. *Prajānana* occurs in the concrete sense in RV, III 29, 1 (Oldenberg, *S B E* XLVI, 305).

<sup>10</sup> This verse is cited and explained in full in Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa I, 41, which is in fact parallel. For Aditi cf. especially Oldenberg *Religion der Veda* pp. 203 sq., Macdonell *Vedic Mythology* pp. 120-39.

<sup>11</sup> Taittiriya Upaniṣad I c, 7 contains after *brāhmaṇacarcana, annadāna, suadāna, lokāna*, where S. Sitarāma renders 'all kinds of food'. Cf. for this section Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka, VII, 14-16 18 19.

<sup>1</sup> This Adhyaya (cf. Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka VIII 1) deals with meditations on the several classes of letters. The construction *yatha syuh—samahitah* is noteworthy. For the verb understood cannot be considered as other than an indicative, so that the optative = the first clause must be indefinite. The same force seems to be found in V, 1, 4. *prastūthapayati—yada—śrāmyet* Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka II, 16. *id yatha vraye palun anarjyargatena paritryet enam evaitah padmanagash sarvan kaman ubhayaiah parigrhyatman dhaita*, VII 1, &c. Anareya Brāhmaṇa V, 34 4. *tam yady etesam trayanam ekamut akumavi adhyā—śhauet taryati Pamadavaya stois prayasatth* Maṇu, VIII 3, 1, 78 (other examples in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 349). So with *idha* Delbrück p. 350, with *yatra*, &c., *ibid* p. 351. So in *kṛtakṛyāḥ syuh* in Sayana's introductions to the RV, curiously misunderstood by Peterson (*Āgastī Handbook*, p. 126). The use differs distinctly from but is easily derived from the use of the opt. with either an opt. (potential) (cf. the use in Avestan, Jackson *P A O S*, April 1896, p. 187, Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* II 372) or an opt. (imperative) in the apodosis, since in either of these cases the future tense is primarily present, whereas when an indie. forms the apodosis the sense is clearly merely indefinite. The use, especially as here in sentence, = common in Homer where the subj. with primary and the opt. with secondary tenses have both this sense (cf. Mounier, *Homeric Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 258 sq., 269 sq.), is found in the subj. in early Latin prose as well as verse in which Greek imitation is always possible (e.g. Cato Major, *de Mor.*, *ingenium prope uti ferrum est ut exerceat conteritur, nisi exerceat rubigine contrahit*), in early English (Halliwell, *English Syntax*, p. 239) &c.

The use of the past part with or without copula (Introd., pp. 64, 65) is significant. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 394-395), followed by Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 176) regards the use as corresponding both to imperf. and aor., but while of course it is dangerous to dogmatise on matters which ultimately depend on a delicate analysis of a language so remote as Vedic Sanskrit, it seems to me that there is a very clear distinction between (1) the aor., the tense of which has just happened, (2) the imperf., the tense of narration,

the body, the whole self, rests on this breath. 'Of this self the truth is like the sibilants, the bones the mutes, the marrow the vowels, and flesh and blood, the fourth part,' the semi-vowels,' so says Hrasva Māndūkya. We have,<sup>2</sup> however, learned that the number was three. Of those three, bones, marrow, and joints, there are three hundred and sixty (parts) on this side and on that side. These make up seven hundred and twenty. Seven hundred and twenty are the days and nights of the year. This self<sup>3</sup> then, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the days in number<sup>4</sup>. He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, = like the days, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the days,<sup>5</sup> becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days.

2 Then comes Kauntharavya. There are three hundred and sixty syllables,<sup>6</sup> three hundred and sixty sibilants, three hundred and sixty unions. What we have called syllables are the days, what we have called sibilants are the nights, what we have called unions are the junctions of the nights and days. So far as regards

and (3) these forms with participles which express a completed action whose results persist into the present. Of course many actions can be regarded from either point of view and differently described, but that is not to say that the effect is not different when different forms are used. To take some of Delbrück's instances RV, I 81, 3 *nd itṛān Indra ādī sand nd jaid nd janyate* the sense is not either 'was born' (imperf) or 'has just been born' (aor), but 'exists, having been born', in Taittiriya Saṃhita II 6 9, 3 *et detā avitvā prajyato vaś pāratat itvā tva no nāgachati gundharvā vai pāry amonur it*, which Delbrück gives as = case of the part corresponding to an aor the sense is clearly different between the continuing absence of the Soma and the one definite past act of the Gundharvas in stealing =. The real tendency of the Mantra and Brāhmaṇa is to assimilate the past to a present though, as is the case with all the expressions of past time in the Mantras, occasionally it may have a narrative sense (e.g. RV, III 48, 23 *Pīṇya dīgdhān sakṣi pīyā*). The present sense—yet with the past action—is very clearly seen in cases like Bhāradvāja VIII, 47 *prathamayāni va stulāḥ | ardharce dyant ca dhūmī ca Atinau collare tatāḥ ||* It is not *stilyante*, for the actual praising is over (antant is regularly used of the Bṛ), and yet it does not mean 'were praised'.

<sup>2</sup> Max Müller takes *anyat* as 'the rest', but it rather means 'the other, the fourth'.

<sup>3</sup> This view is apparently Śākalya's (Sayana), the first three being his, to which Māndūkya adds a fourth. The threefold view, with *ghṛā* for *stara*, *tyajyama* for *sparta*, is found in II, 2, 4 where the difference of terms denotes a difference in dates.

<sup>4</sup> Anandātīrtha explains all this of Viṣṇu as usual.

<sup>5</sup> The symbolism of the year is common in all religions, cf., e.g., Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* IV, 284-285.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the Khila MS (B) at end (fol. 191<sup>a</sup>—Schiffelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, p. 258) *etāṣāṃ eva dardṛtānam sarāṣṭham sāyasya aṇe salohitām ātmāna yā evāna ved ān svadhyaṇim adhitā*. For the compound, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, I 149, 150.

<sup>7</sup> Syllables are vowels, sibilants consonants and their unions the Saudhī (Sayana). Sayana takes *sarā* as separate, to explain how it comes to = 360. But though the construction is illogical it is regular in the Brāhmaṇas (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 430 b, cf. for *īakṛt*, Pischel, *Prakrit Grammar*, p. 409), and *sarā* should not be printed apart as in S.

the gods. Now as regards the self. The syllables which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self bones, the syllabants which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self marrow, the marrow is indeed the real breath, for it is seed, and without breath seed is not effused. Or if it is effused without breath, it will decay and will not produce. The unions which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self joints. Of these three,\* bones, marrow, and joints, there are five hundred and forty parts on this side and on that. They make one thousand and eighty, and one thousand and eighty<sup>2</sup> are the rays of the sun. They make the *brhats* verses and thus day. Thus the self<sup>3</sup> which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech is like the syllables in number. He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the syllables, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the syllables, becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days.

§ Bādhyā<sup>1</sup> says, 'There are four persons, the person of the body, the person of the metres, the person of the Veda, and the great person. That which we have called the person of the body is the corporeal self. Its essence is the incorporeal conscious self. That which we have called the person of the metres is the collection of letters. Its essence is the letter 'a'.<sup>2</sup> That which we have called the person of the Veda is that by which one knows the Vedas, Rgveda, Yajurveda, and Sāmaveda. Its essence is the Brahman priest. Therefore should one choose a Brahman<sup>3</sup> priest who is full of *brahman* and can discern flaws

It is curious as § points out that no comment is made on the similar passage in III, 2, 1. For *kanuśa*<sup>4</sup> of the Dhātupadha root *kanuś* which Franke (*Zeitschrift Orient. Journ.*, VIII, 343) compares with Greek *κάνω* Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 170. The name seems not to occur elsewhere, except in the parallel passage in Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka VIII, 2.

\* The words inserted by B are quite out of place here and show how little that MS can be relied upon. For *suṣṭhāna* of Atharvaveda II 12.7. Roth, *Z D M G*, LVIII, 202. For the construction of Baudhīyana Dharma Sūtra II, 17, 22, 37. *J R A S*, 1909 contra Bühtlingk *Sachs Ber* 1892 p. 197.

<sup>1</sup> This extraordinary doctrine *Siyana* can only support by the Ātharvāna passage (Traṭina Upaniṣad, I 8 = Matsi Upaniṣad, VI 8. Bloomfield, *Index Concordance* p. 2002 a) *śatāra rājanā śatāśaḥ varṇam mahā prajāḥ prajānam mīlayaty eva suryaś*, which he explains includes by denotation the eighty. There are 2080 syllables in thirty *brhats*.

<sup>2</sup> *Vijeta* according to Anandātīrtha, who has considerable difficulty in working out the details of his interpretation here.

<sup>3</sup> Bādhyā is undoubtedly correct. *Paśhyat* is merely a slip of Tīpēndraśāstra, and did not deserve record in Moti & Williams' *Dut*. *śaś(g)at* is read in Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. II, 3. 6. The precision in the use of the aorist is to be noted, cf. *Introd.* p. 60.

<sup>5</sup> The Brahman priest is required to guard the sacrifice and sit in the South (the place of the dead), Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 2, 8, 7. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 141, n. 2. He is not here in any way connected with the Atharvaveda (the later connection is probably due to his employment (Winternitz, p. 139 n. 2) in the household ritual which is found mainly in



It hath filled heaven and earth and the sky 'The sun is the self of all that stands and moves' This I regard as the regular <sup>2</sup> *Samhita* <sup>3</sup> composed, thus says Bādha. For the Bāhvricas consider him in the great hymn, the Adhvaryus in the fire, the Chandogas in the Mahāvratā rite. They see him in this earth, in heaven, in the air, in the ether, in the waters, in plants, in trees, in the moon, in the constellations, in all beings. Him they call *brahman*. The self which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, <sup>4</sup> like the year in number. He, who recites to another the self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, and is like the year,

4. To him the Vedas yield no milk, he has no part in what his teacher has taught him. He knows not the path of virtue. A Rv. says this also (RV, X, 71, 6) 'He who forsakes the friend who knows his friends' in speech he has no part. What he hears, he hears in vain, he knows not the path of virtue. This means that he has no part in what he has studied and that he does not know the path of virtue. So a man who knows this should not<sup>5</sup> lay the fire for another, nor sing the Sāmāns of the Mahāvratā for another, nor recite the Śāstras of that day for another. Only<sup>6</sup> may he recite for a father or a teacher, for that is done for oneself. We have said<sup>7</sup> that this incorporeal-conscious self and that sun are one and the same. Where these two are separated,<sup>8</sup> the sun is seen like the moon,<sup>9</sup> its rays do not manifest themselves,

<sup>2</sup> All the above must be Bādha's view, just as III, 2, 2 gave Kaṇṭharavya's views. The following alludes to the fact that the Adhvaryus's mystic speculations centre in the Agnicayana, cf. Eggeling, *J B E*, XLIII, xxv.

<sup>3</sup> The section runs on in a way that cannot be early. V, 1, 1 and 2 is precisely similar, and the present section division must remain of doubtful (though early) date. The divisions of the Śāṅkhayana are similarly illogical. For the loc. cf. Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 205.

<sup>4</sup> Sayana points out that Taittiriya Aranyaka, I, 3, II, 15, reads in this verse *sakṣividams*, a point overlooked in Bloomfield *Index Concordance*, p. 700<sup>b</sup>. Sayana's reference does tend to show that he also wrote a Taittiriya Aranyaka commentary, which on other grounds might be deemed very doubtful (cf. III, 2, 3 n. 5).

<sup>5</sup> I.e. not as Adhvaryu, Udgātṛ or Hotṛ priest. It is impossible to square the total prohibition here with V, 1, 5, which (see n. 5) contemplates a breach of the rule but it agrees with the opinion of some<sup>7</sup> (cf. V, 3, 3 see n. 1 on that passage).

<sup>6</sup> A frequent exception. Cf. V, 3, 3 n. 1.

<sup>7</sup> III, 2, 3. The relevance of this passage is not obvious. Sayana takes it as a reflexion induced by the idea of the attainment of *brahman* in the brief space of life, whence omens as to the duration of life are inserted. The connexion of sun and self is elsewhere used to give omens of death. In *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad*, V, 4, 2, the sun appears as white only to the man about to die. The parallel passages in the Śāṅkhayana are VIII, 7, and XI, 3, 4.

<sup>8</sup> This is not very logical, as there is no reason why the separation of the two should be a sign of death. The rest of the signs are clearly old folklore ideas pressed into service. For the extensive literature on Vedic superstitions, see Hillebrandt, *Kutsal Edebiyat*, pp. 167 sq., 183-185, Hatfield, *Andasatdāksanam*, *J A O S*, XL, 202, &c., Bloomfield,



know that this is so. Next let him cover his ears and listen, then there is a sound as of a burning fire or of a chariot. If he does not hear that sound, let him know that this is so. Next when the fire appears blue like the neck of a peacock,<sup>11</sup> or when he sees lightning in a cloudless sky, or no lightning in a cloudy sky, or in a great cloud sees bright rays as it were, let him know that it is so. Next when he sees the ground as though burning, let him know that this is so. So far as regards the visible signs. Then come the dreams.<sup>12</sup> He sees a black man with black teeth, he kills him, a boar kills him, a monkey jumps on him; the wind carries him swiftly along, having swallowed gold he spits it out, he eats honey, he chews stalks, he carries a single lotus,

in other languages. Cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 284, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 487, Aufrecht, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 431 my note *J R A S* 1909.

The Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, xiv) has a passage which may be reminiscent of this text *agnir vaitanaro . tasyaśo ghoro dhātots yam* (wrong reading ?) *śat kṛmav apidhaya kṛmots sa yadokṛmasyan bhavots nauman ghoraṁ kṛmots*.

For *upadeśa*, *mīra* which denotes literally the noise of going and is particularly in place here, cf. *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, IV, 9, 3. *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, I, 243, *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, I, 37, 3, with Oertel's note, *RV*, I, 74, 7, with Oldenberg's note (*S B E*, XLVI, 94), Schmidt, *K Z*, XXV, 55. Scheffelowitz (*Zur Stammbildung in den indo-germanischen Sprachen* § 9) compares *RV*, IX, 77, 4 *urūdyd*, which he considers as going back to IG *pago*, cf. Greek *παγός*. The construction above *driyate* and *adikkhyeta* in parallel uses and below *driyate pūyen na pūyen pūyeta* are decidedly curious (cf. *Introd.* p. 63). The temptation to amend to *driyeta* is very strong and on the whole I incline to think that it would be dangerous to insist on these examples. The case of *upadeśa*—*driyante* differs, for the two verbs are not parallel. The first is an instruction, the second expresses categorically the result (and *driyante* may have helped to bring about the incorrect *driyate*). In III, 2, 4 where *upadeśa* and *āha* occur, the *āha* is very strange, and one would like to take *śakṣyaty āha*—*śakṣyaty* as two sentences both dependent on *driyate*. There is, however, the real difficulty that *a—/ha* would be a strange combination, and the division of the sentences is also curious though no more curious than the *āha*. I suspect some corruption of the text. Śāyana renders differently. He takes the whole as one Mantra and supplies *dhātots* as a subject for *āha*, and so in the next sentence he interpolates *dhātots āha* in sense. In the numerous passages in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* which are more or less parallel (see the ref. cited in III, 2, 6 n. 5) no such *āha* occurs, and *śakṣyaty* has no prefix. But probably *a—śakṣyaty* must go together. *āha* might, of course, be taken as a first person and made part of the quotation (cf. Speyer § 178), but this is not likely, and for the indef. opt., cf. III, 2, 1, n. 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Mayuragrīvaś* is perhaps intended by the reading of B *mayuragrīvaś antreḥ* (but *Saṅkhyāna* has *mayuragrīva* when it can be 'red'), and undoubtedly *grīvaś* is the form alone recognized by Panini and usual in the earlier literature *J R A S*, 1906 pp. 916-919. Probably the reading was originally *mayuragrīvaśreḥ* by an incorrect Sandhi for *mayura grīvaś*. For similar irregular Sandhi, cf. Bühler, *S B E*, II xli (from *Āpastamba*), Macdonell, *Praśastiśruti*, I xxvii, and *v*, 3, 2, n. 9, III, 1, 3, n. 2. For the next portent, cf. Hirschel, *Indische Studien*, I, 112.

<sup>12</sup> The plural must be right. Cf. Markandeya Purāṇa, XLIII, 181, Hillebrandt, op cit, p. 184.

<sup>13</sup> 'Red' = colour (Sayana), for red as unlucky, cf. *Z D H G*, VI, 117.

he drives with a team of asses and<sup>14</sup> boars; wearing a wreath of red flowers, he drives a black cow with a black calf towards the south<sup>15</sup>. If he sees any of these, he should fast and cook a pot of milk, and offer it, reciting a verse of the Rātri hymn (RV., X, 127, 16) to each oblation, and having fed the Brahmins with other food,<sup>16</sup> himself eat the oblation. Let him know that the person within all beings who is not heard,<sup>17</sup> not reached, not thought, not subdued, not seen, not understood, not classified, but who hears, thinks, sees, classifies, sounds, understands, and knows is his own self<sup>18</sup>.

5 Now comes this Upaniṣad of the whole speech. All these indeed are Upaniṣads of the whole speech, but thus they so call. The mutes are the earth, the sibilants the sky, the vowels heaven. The mutes are fire, the sibilants air, the vowels the sun. The mutes are the Rgveda, the sibilants the Yajurveda, the vowels the Sāmaveda. The mutes are the eye, the sibilants the ear, the vowels the mind. The mutes are the up-breathing, the sibilants the down-breathing, the vowels the back-breathing. Then comes this divine lute<sup>1</sup>. The

<sup>14</sup> 'Or' (Sayana), which may be more correct.

<sup>15</sup> The ten dreams are so taken by the commentator and by Max Müller whose note (p. 161) is apparently wrong. *Etsam ātmā* is noteworthy. The neut. of the pronoun is practically nominal and is to be compared with the neut. in predication, III, 2, 2, n. 4. So in Latin, e.g. Horace, *Sat.*, 1, 7 *Lydorum quicquid*. The parallel passage in the Śaṅkhāyana has corrected the original *ātmā* of the MS, but the correspondence is conclusive.

<sup>16</sup> Cooked in the house (Sayana). See Śaṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, V, 5, 9 and my article, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 929, for *sthāpaka*, see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 4, 19. Gṛhyasamgraha, I 114, Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 210, n. 4. For the causative with instr. and acc. cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 224 sq.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 277 a, 282 b, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* § 21, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 49. According to Panini, 1, 4 § 2, and the examples cited in the *Ka. śka* 3, 1, ad loc., here we should have two accusatives.

<sup>17</sup> *Ātā* is rendered by Sayana, *ātmā dehendriyādātengā. āt vāśā ana it' iśat*, while *Ānandārtha* suggests *adīśat*.

<sup>18</sup> This is the most advanced point in the definition of the Ātman arrived at in the Āraṇyaka. The Ātman is not object, but subject only—as Sayana says, *ātmā vāso na śhacati vāso. tu śhacaty eva*. This occurs frequently later and with it the doctrine that the self cannot be known. Sayana cites the *antaryamābrahmāna*, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 7, 13 the *āntarbrahmāna*, ibid., III, 8, 11, the *hauṁtaka* Upaniṣad, I, 8, the *Prāṇa* Upaniṣad, I, 6, and the *Ṇṛgubhotastarajanya* Upaniṣad, II. See also Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 133 sq., E.T., pp. 147 sq. Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, IV, 13, is devoted to this topic (= *hena* Upaniṣad).

<sup>19</sup> i.e. the human body. This metaphor explains *Prāṇa* Upaniṣad, II 2, where *vāso* (V, 1, 4) is equated to *śarīra*, which Max Müller (*S. B. E.*, XV, 274, n. 3) finds unintelligible. Connected with *Vāso* is *Ānandārtha*'s explanation of the word *darśi*. *Āmbhāna* is a curious word. I think it is from *anu* + *āmbhā* (as in Class. Sansk. for *āmbhā*, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 194). Compare *ambhā* for *anu* + *vāra* and *jambhā* for *jānu* + *bhā* (ibid., 59). The omission, before *v* (common) led to omission before *ś* and sporadically before *ṣ*. The meaning would be 'sounding board' (?) Cf. v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 744.

¶ Now Kṛṣṇaharita<sup>1</sup> proclaims this Brahmana<sup>2</sup> as it were regarding speech to him<sup>3</sup> Prajapati, the year,<sup>4</sup> after creating creatures, burst. He put himself together by the metres. Because he put himself together by means of the metres, therefore is it the Samhitā. Of that Samhitā the letter *n* is the strength, the letter *s* the breath, the self. He who knows the verses in the Samhitā and<sup>5</sup> the letters *n* and *s*, he knows the Samhitā with its breath and its strength. Let him know that this is life-giving.<sup>6</sup> If he is in doubt<sup>7</sup> whether to say it with an *n* or without an *n*, let him say it with an *n*. If he is in doubt whether to say it with an *s* or without an *s*, let him say it with an *s*. Hrasiṃ Māndūkeya says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Samhitā, and if we say the teaching<sup>8</sup> of

must be taken that the *schneumon* is a synonym for what is very piercing: the nearest approximation to this idea is the passage in Atharvaveda, VI 139 5 (cited in Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 86), which refers to the *schneumon* (*m*) skill in chopping up and then restoring his work.

<sup>1</sup> A son of Harita who was dark in colour (Sayana), cf. Hiranyadant Vāids, II, 1, 5. A Kumara Harita (so, not Harita) appears in Bhādarānyaka Upaniṣad, II, 6 3, IV, 6 3, VI, 4, 4. Weber (*Indian Literature* p. 50) reads Harita, and the lawyer is always so called (*ibid.*, p. 269) even in Aṣṭamā Dharma Sūtra I, 10, 19, 12 26. On the other hand Vārtika 8 on Pāṇini I 1, 73 recognizes Haritakāśi, and Pāṇini IV, 1, 200 Haritayana as names, where Harita appears. Weber's Harita here is therefore probably wrong and Śākhayana Āranyaka, V III, 11, has *kṛṣṇaharita*.

<sup>2</sup> Brahmana here means secret doctrine like Upaniṣad. *Loc. cit.* seems to be used to indicate the somewhat unusual sense, the Śākhayana version has *eva*, cf. I 1, 2, n 3, *J A S*, 1908, p. 1193 n 1. Sayana in his commentary repeatedly has phrases like *antaryamīdriṣṭiṃ*, the secret doctrine of the *antaryāmin*, see III, 2, 4, n 18, and cf. the name of Iṣṭhāṇyaka Upaniṣad, 1, 4 (*śrutaratnabrahma*), Max Müller, *S B E*, XL, 25 and the common *īśyotiṣa brāhmaṇam*.

<sup>3</sup> To his pupil or son (Anandatīrtha and Sīyana).

<sup>4</sup> The reading of B, *samatsarum* (see Introd. p. 3) must be a correction to improve the sense. But it could never have been corrupted into *samatsarum* if *prajapati* as the year is a Brahmanic commonplace (for its deeper significance, see Eggeing *S I E*, XLIII 22 sq.), e.g. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, II, 17 2, VI, 19, 7. Maitreyanī Samhitā I 20 B, Kauṣṭaki Brāhmana, VI, 18, Śākhāyana Āranyaka, I, 2, &c. The phrase *Prajapatiḥ prajāḥ sṛjati* *vyasramiṣṭa* is frequent in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI-IX, not in I-IV, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, VIII, 268, and for a similar case cf. II, 4 3, n 14. One might translate 'he is the year'. Cf., however, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, V, 2, 1, 1 and 2. The confusion of *vyasramiṣṭa* and *īśa* is another example of the confusion of *śruti* and *śānti* so common in Śākhāyana. Cf. Leaman in Whitney's *Translation of the Atharva Veda*, pp. 57, 1045, J. Hettel, *Teotēkkyō* 1, p. xvi, Roth, *Z D M G*, XLVIII, 106-111.

<sup>5</sup> This is the literal rendering. Sīyana takes it, 'Who recites the verses thinking of the *n* and *s* which accompany the Samhitā'.

<sup>6</sup> To the Samhitā (Sayana) or perhaps to the reciter, if not to both.

<sup>7</sup> Sīyana takes it, 'If a pupil ask his teacher' but this is unnecessary. The question is, he says, whether the reflection on the Samhitā is to take the differences of *n* and *s* into account or not.

<sup>8</sup> Sayana refers this to Śrāvastī's doctrine, III, 2, 1. For *śrāvastī* cf. Kauṣṭaki Brāhmaṇa, XIV, 1, Śākhāyana Āranyaka, I, 1, where Dr. Friedländer renders 'I nreī hen l, geniden l'.

Māndukeya, then the letters *n* and *s* are obtained for us' Sāhavya Sākalya<sup>1</sup> says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Samhitā, and if we say the teaching of Māndukeya, then the letters *n* and *s* are obtained for us' Then the seers, the Kāvaseyas, knowing this,<sup>2</sup> say, 'To what end shall we repeat the Veda, to what end shall we sacrifice? For we sacrifice breath in speech,<sup>3</sup> or in breath speech. For what is the beginning, that is the end' These Samhitās let no one<sup>4</sup> tell to one who is not a resident pupil, who has not been with the teacher for one year, and who is not himself to become a teacher. Thus say the teachers<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The sayings are identical, and apparently this is intended to denote that the doctrine received universal acceptance. The passage may indicate (cf also Sāṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 10, 3 where Sākalya is younger apparently than Māndukeya) that the Māndukeya Sākalya had its Samhitā text before Sākalya produced the Pada Pāṭha, which is quite likely.

<sup>2</sup> This is a clear proof that the holders of the Aranyaka doctrine rejected sacrifices or recitations as means of knowledge, cf Bhāṣāgāyana Upaniṣad, I, 5, 25; Jāṣṭakī Upaniṣad, II, 5; Chandogya Upaniṣad, V, 21-24; Taittiriya Upaniṣad, II, 5; Deussen, *Phil d Upanishads*, p. 63. A Tora Kāvaseya *parulita* of Janamejaya occurs in Khila I, 9, 6 and m—as already noted by Colebrooke, *Essays*, I, 72, see Oldenberg *Z D M G*, XLII, 230 sq—the Aitareya Brahman, IV, 27, VII, 39, VIII 21. For the spelling cf Schefelowitz *Die Apokryphen des Ageda*, Adilinda p. 190. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 239. Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Lit*, I, 199) uses the story of Javasa as the son of a non Brahmin (Aitareya Brahmana II 39) as a piece of evidence in favour of the theory of the attribution to the Hantiryaś of philosophic speculation over the origin of the doctrine of transmigration (cf. Introd. pp 50, 51, Garbe, *Beiträge zur indischen Kulturgeschichte*, pp 1 sq). He argues that the Brahmins merely accepted and made these doctrines their own by adopting them along with the doctrine of the four Āśramas. This all seems very doubtful. That among the priests none should rise superior to the sacrificial cultus is contrary to all religious history. That hermits, &c., were originally not of the priestly caste is a mere theory and not a probable one. Winternitz view leads him (p. 202 n. 1) to adopt the improbable theory of Aranyaka as a text to be studied by Vānspasthas for which he quotes the (late) Aranyaka Upaniṣad (Deussen *Sech u Upanishads* p. 693) and Ramaraja (Thibaut, *S B E*, \LVIII 645). Cf Introd., p. 16. It must always be remembered that the Brahmanas contain already in germ all the ideas which make up the fundamental doctrine of the Upaniṣads, even the doctrine of transmigration is presaged in the doctrine of repeated deaths in the other world. It is impossible to explain why the Brahmins became so completely the bearers of the *ātman* doctrine if it was not theirs *ex initio*. Professor Macdonell has told me that he concurs in this view, which thus gains great weight, and see my notes *J R A S*, 1903, pp. 838-863, 1141. The Kāvaseyas are cited by Sākalya on Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (ed. Roer, p. 257) as opposed to works, Weber *Ind Stud.* II, 458.

<sup>3</sup> Cf Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana I 2, 6.

<sup>4</sup> Cf V, 3, 3, Weber, *Induan Literature*, p. 49, n. 35.

<sup>5</sup> Mahidasa, &c. (Anandasturtha). Cf I, 1, 1, n. 5, II, 3, 5, n. 4. Probably the plural is only *ministers*.

## ARANYAKA IV

ĀśVALĀYANA (Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 12, 10) gives the following account of the purpose of the Mahānāmni verses. On the fifth day of the *prsthya* six day ceremony, at the midday pressing of the Soma, corresponding to the Niglevalya Śāstra, the Udgātṛs sing sometimes the Śākvara Sāman as one of the Prsthā Stotras,<sup>1</sup> and then<sup>2</sup> use the Mahānāmni verses as the basis of the Sāman. These number nine, but for the purposes of the Sāman they are made into three, each consisting of three verses. These verses are recited *adhyardhakāram*, that is, first one and a half verses are recited, then comes a pause, then the remaining one and a half, followed by the syllable *om*. Then are recited the nine *purita padāni*, additional verses. These may either be recited simply straight on as they stand in the text, or the first five may be made into two sets of five syllables each, thus

*Etā hi eva i ev i hi Agniṣu* i the *hi* being taken without Sandhi, the last four *puritapadāni* being repeated without a pause in the middle. See also Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10 and comm.

The Mahānāmni verses occur in the Āraṇjya Samhitā and in the Naigeya Śākhi at the end of the Pūrnarika of the Sāmaveda, and as one of the Khilas of the Rgveda, see Peterson, *Second Report*, p. 97, Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, pp. 134-136. They are referred to in the Bhṛhaddevata, VIII, 100, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10, Rgvidhāna, IV, 25 and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11, 12, &c. From these sources, and from Baudhāyana, cited in Oldenberg, *Prolegomena* p. 509, n. it appears that they followed directly upon the verse *īc cham* 30r, which, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9, is the end of the Rgveda Samhitā (in the Bāskala recension), and, according to Narayana on Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 5, 9, is the end of the Bāskala recension.<sup>3</sup> It is not, however, quite clear what this means, since *īc cham* 30r occurs as the last verse of two Khilas, V, 1 and 3, in Scheftelowitz's edition, viz the *tamyānam* and *pradhīranam* Khilas, and the three Khilas, V, 1-3, the second being the *nairhastham*, have 5+3+7=15 verses. The view of

<sup>1</sup> For these see especially Eggeling, *S B E*, LII, 22 sq.

<sup>2</sup> The Śākvara is normally based on Samaveda, II 1151-1153 (Sayana and Mahidhara cited by Eggeling p. 22 n. 2).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Oldenberg's note on Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9 and *Ind. Stud.*, LV, 150.

Oldenberg, who had not<sup>6</sup> the evidence of the MS of the Khilas before him, was (*Prolegomena*, p 502) that the Samhita ended with the first *tac cham yor*, i.e. with Khila, V, 1, and Scheftelowitz (pp 11, 132) holds that this is correct. Oldenberg, however, held (p 509) that the Mahanāmnī verses followed directly after *tac cham yor*, and (p 501) expressed the view that the following ten verses were some of them modern. But of the direct evidence for the immediate sequence of the Mahanāmnī verses, cited by Oldenberg, the Rgvidhāna alone fully bears him out, for the Khila MS has the Mahanāmnī verses after the *pradhvārdnam* Khila, and this is probably the meaning of Brhaddevala, VIII, 94, as interpreted by Prof Macdonell. It is an easy conjecture that the Rgvidhāna, which has other coincidences with the Brhaddevala<sup>7</sup>, followed that work, but misunderstood the word *caturtham*, which most probably must mean 'the fourth of the hymns after X, 190'. This fact weakens greatly the force of Oldenberg's argument from the modern character of the last ten verses, and in point of fact it is difficult to deny that the verse *tac cham yor* is modern in appearance, and that it need not be separated in time from the last seven verses. For the second *tac cham yor* being the end of the Samhita in the Baskala recension, we have the clear evidence of the commentator on the Caranavyūha,<sup>8</sup> who actually cites the verses. Dr Scheftelowitz considers that the commentator is untrustworthy, and later than Sayana, but this appears very doubtful. We know, he argues, that the commentator explains the eight extra hymns attributed to the Dākala Śakha by the Anuvakanukramanī as being seven of the Valakhilyas and the *samyānam* hymn of fifteen verses but the number should be ten, as the *samyānam* hymn is really composed of three hymns. But it is difficult to maintain that it is impossible that the fifteen verses, despite their difference of contents, were not regarded in early days as one hymn, for several of the Rgvedic hymns are notoriously patchwork, and this applies more strongly still to later Samhitas.

Much more important is the question of their antiquity. Oldenberg makes the Mahanāmnī verses an exception to his general view, that the Khilas are on the whole of later origin, and holds that they are coeval with the Rgveda, and were merely omitted because of some reason of ritual teaching from the ten Mandalas. Dr Scheftelowitz who disputes Oldenberg's general position, and accepts Hillebrandt's theory of the purer ritual tradition, assigns the verses (p 3) to the end of the Rgvedic period. Further, Oldenberg<sup>9</sup> has suggested

<sup>6</sup> He takes no notice of the new evidence in his review of Scheftelowitz *Göttinger Anz.*, 1907, p 227 for which and for other valuable papers I am indebted to his kindness.

<sup>7</sup> Macdonell *Brhaddevala*, I, 147.

<sup>8</sup> Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, pp 495, 501, 502.

<sup>9</sup> *S.B.E.*, XXX, 156.



that the verses are alluded to as the Śakvan verses in Rgveda, VII, 33, 4, X 71, 11, and this suggestion is at least plausible. They are apparently referred to as Mahanāmās in the Atharvaveda and Yajurveda (see below). It is borne out to some extent at least by the character of the language, which shows the rare forms *ānulanmīśah* *stute* *vide* *ite*, *rījase*, and *samnyase*. The metre is also of an archaic type in so far as resolutions are frequently necessary to restore it. The Khala Anśhrāmī gives the following note *vidā dāśa padaś ca pañca Visvomitra Indra 1a Prajāpatiḥ Andram pūnam anustubham purisapadany Agneyaraisnavandrapaurṇadairim tairajam dāśyapañcamyaḥ amīhan calurthi mankutarim sapṭam purastidbrāhmi natamyanthe pañkū*. As a matter of fact as both Weber\* and Oldenberg recognize, the verses are not preserved in their primitive form but only as modified to suit their supposed sacred character. In verses 2, 5, and 8, which were apparently originally *anustubh*, the fourth *pada* has been omitted for the insertion of a sort of refrain. Verses 1, 3 and 6 are in *anustubh*. Verse 4 appears to be 8+12+8+8, verse 7, 12+8+8+8, verse 9, 8+8+8+8+8. The rest is in no regular metre. Oldenberg (p 33) considers that originally the metre consisted of seven and five sets of eight syllables respectively but this seems hardly borne out by the facts. It should be noted that the Khala text manufactures the last four of the nine *purisapadani* into one verse ( ) and in this respect is certainly not old for the *purisapadani* cannot reasonably be held to have ever made up a verse. They are referred to, however as five in the Kauṣṭhika Brahmana XXIII 2, and connected with Prajāpati Agni, Indra Pūṣan and Devah, and in the Bṛhaddevata VIII, 102, they are connected with the same deities save that Viṣṇu is substituted for the Devāḥ (so the A version, the II vers on omits Prajāpati, while Mītra text includes both Prajāpati and the Devāḥ see Macdonell's note). They are also mentioned in the Pañica vimśa Brahmana XIII 4 12, where elaborate directions are given as to their selection to make up the *śuk ara saman* Lātyajana Sutra, IV, 10 18 Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra V, 6 13, &c and in the Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 4, V, 7, VI, 24, Atharvaveda XI 7, 6, Vajrasaneyi Samhitā, XXIII, 36 Kathaka Samhitā, X 10, Taittiriya Samhitā, V, 2, 22 1\*.

The verses contain several phrases reminiscent of the Rgveda perhaps borrowed from earlier hymns, at least they tend to convey an impression of second hand use *jetaram aparajitam*=RV I, 11, 2, *sā mah parśad ah*=RV, X 187, 1, *Indram dhanasya sakhye* is the last *pada* of RV VIII, 3 5<sup>d</sup> (thus I owe to Bloom

\* Ind. Stud. XII 68.

\* For the last four refs I am indebted to Bloomfield *Pāṇc Concordance* p 696\* who gives other passages, cf also Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XXII, 358, Eggeling *S B E*, XLI, xx, XLIV, 330 n 2.

field, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 210<sup>b</sup>); *sam anyāsu bravavahai*=RV, I, 30, 6, *sakhā sūśro adityah*=RV, I, 187, 3<sup>1</sup>, *śavisīha vajrīm rājase*=RV., I, 80, 1<sup>a</sup> (with *gata*) These last two cases seem to me strongly in favour of the later date of these verses, for *bravavahai* is not unnatural in RV, I, 30, 6 where it seems to refer to Indra and the speaker who are to agree in other battles, the previous half verse referring to a conflict, but it is distinctly awkward here where the first half verse has no reference to a fight or other occasion of association. This only, however, proves that the *Mahānāmni* verses are not among the earliest parts of the Rgveda.

The last four *pūrtapādāni* are made out of the preceding verses, *evā hi śakrō*, from v. 2, *vai hi śakrō*, from v. 3, *vaśāśi dnu*, from v. 4. The Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 9, shows that other *pādas* of the verses were used independently in the ritual, *pracetana pracetayayāhi pāda matsva i kratuś chanda riam brhat sumna a dhehi no vasan ity anustup* : Ibid., 12, has. *ud yad bradhnyā v utapam it paridhanyā i* : *eva hy evaiva hmdra i evā hi śakra vali hi śakra it jāpita* : *apah pūrtasam haritāś sūnam it jāyoti* : and again the *pūrtapādāni* in VI, 3, 26.

For the question of the 'authorship' of this Āraṇyaka by Āśvalayana, cf. *Intro*, pp. 18 sq. For the view that this forms a sort of Āśvalayana Samhita may be compared the fact that there is an Āpastambya Mantrapāṭha, a collection of Gṛhya verses and formulae, to accompany the Āpastamba Gṛhya Sūtra. So too, as Oldenberg (*S B E*, XXX, 3-11) has conclusively<sup>12</sup> shown, the Mantra Brahmana was prepared to accompany Gobhila's Gṛhya Sūtra, though it is not apparently ascribed to Gobhila, just as IV is not attributed to Āśvalayana in the Āraṇyaka itself. Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Lit*, I, 232) merely repeats Max Müller (*Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 314 sq., 339).

O generous one, show<sup>a</sup> us a path, proclaim the regions, guide us, lord of many might, wealthy one || 1 ||

With these aids of thine, wise one, make us wise, for glory and for strength, Indra. For thine is strength || 2 ||

For wealth, for might, thunderer, most powerful, bearer of the bolt, thou

<sup>12</sup> I do not consider Winternitz (*Mantrapāṭha*, I, xxxi sq.) to have refuted Oldenberg.

<sup>a</sup> *evāśi* is rendered *etāsi* by Sayana, and S takes it as a Vedic form of *vade*, i.e. imper of the aor. of *√vad* (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 851). Possibly this is correct (cf. *vade* in *ver* 5), and it is from *√vad* in the sense 'find', for which see the examples in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, pp. 866<sup>b</sup>, 867<sup>a</sup>. But it may perhaps be really *evāśi* the subj. of the aor. of *√vad* (Whitney, § 849) as an injunctive from *vi + √vad*. The accent would then, however, probably have been *evāśi*, but exceptions are not unknown. The same question arises in RV, I, 40, 3 *evāśi sakhāśau śak*. For the accent, *pūrtanām*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 319. For *loc*, cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 58, 122, Fischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 1, 2, Oldenberg, *Keligion des Veda*, p. 239, n. 6.



Place us in thy favour, ancient one, lord of the thunder, bright one Most powerful, thy rewards are extolled For the strong god bears rule || 8 ||

Lord of man, slayer of Vṛtra, this new hymn? I offer now to thee Among others let us two converse together. The hero who fares for the cows is a kind and guileless friend || 9 ||

Thus,\* thus, O Agni Thus, thus, O Indra Thus, thus, O Viṣṇu Thus thus, O Pūṣan Thus, thus, O Gods For he is strong For he has strength and will, according to his will On all sides\* come hither Show, generous one, show

\* This is doubtful *midnyase*, the variant of the other texts save SV, is remarkable as being accented, and does not help. It looks like an obvious error or correction for *sāmyase*, which becomes *sāmyase* SV, Nageya Śakhi, and then by haplography *sāmyas*, SV, Ātanya Samhitā, and then *midnyase* through the frequent mistake of *s* for *m* in Śarada MSS. *midnyase* makes no good sense, but *sāmyase* also is very difficult (even if taken as Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 404) would take it in RV, V, 17, 2, as a first person). It comes apparently from *as* Dr Schefelowitz now agrees with this view (cf my remark in *J R A S* 1907, p 224). For *tan tan* (i e *tan*) can be read (supply *suktan* or, with *tan*, *mantram*) but *tanym* may be from *anu*, meaning praiseworthy. The dual *bravimāhe* in the original context refers to the singer and Indra who are in other (contexts) to be united. Here it must (cf n 7 on I, 1, 1) mean something of the same sort, but *anye u* has no longer any direct antecedent. SV *arjāu* is merely a facile correction like so many SV readings. For the loc, *gō u*, cf Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p 122, Speyer, *Vedic und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 81 b, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 301, 304, *A J P*, XIII, 264. *Sāmyase* as a dat hardly makes sense.

\* Sayana takes *eva* as from *as* and *a*. The sentence is practically a mere exclamation and cannot be translated. The words *āyo*, &c., yield no sense as they stand. Sayana renders, 'He who comes to think what is to be thought of for our weal, let him come to think what is to be thought of'. The variant *āyo* is no help, though it might mean 'Come to the man who deserves favour', cf Taittiriya Samhitā, II, 1, 2, 2. For the *phiti*, a 31, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 298.

\* Cf Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 12, where the sentence runs *chy eva ānandapāṭi vishvātha vāda maghatan vāda it* from which it may be legitimate to assume that *eva* should be supplied in the *puruṣapada*. The last *vāda* may point to *vāda* being the form *vishvāthā* in RV means either (1) everywhere, I, 141 6, (2) always, V 8, 4.

The Taittiriya Āraṇyaka, I, 20, has *evā hy etā | etā hy Agne | etā hi Vājo | etā hi hundra | etā hi Pūṣan | etā hi devā* | when Sayana renders *eva* as *ayanaśchidhā* and *etā* as *etā*, *at* *propti* *gō* *hama*, and supplies *an*, 'Thou art desirous'. *ānandapāṭi* *ayā* *survalamaheturā* *grāndhīr* *ugā*. Ibid., 23, has *evā hy etā | etā hy Agne | etā hi Vājo | etā hi hundra | etā hi Pūṣan | etā hi devā* | The accents are those of the Ānandaśrauta text (I, 83, 89), and may be wrong. In the Nakrayana Samhitā, II, 3, 18 (a reference which I owe to Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*, p. 303\*) all the MSS have *etā* (or *evā*) *hy Agne*. The Harastakī Brahmana, XXIII, 2, gives two accounts of the Mahānāṁikā or Śakvanā, and gives as the five *puruṣapada*s *etā hy etā | evā hy Agne | etā hundra | etā hi Pūṣan | etā hi devā* |.

✓ It is by no means obvious how these verses came to be considered as an especially fruitful rain spell. As such they are clearly recognised in the Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 2, and the Khadira Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 5, 22 sq., where the Śakvanāṛita is clearly a rite of sympathetic magic to produce plentiful rain (see Oldenberg, *Re igion der I ede*, pp 420-422, with whose remarks I fully concur).

## ĀRANYAKA V

## ADHYĀYA I.

IN the Mahāvratā ceremony there are twenty-five verses to accompany the kindling of the fire<sup>1</sup>. In the twenty-one<sup>2</sup> verses (used in the Viśvavati) four are inserted before the second last, beginning, 'With fuel Agni' (RV., VIII, 44, 1). A bull is to be offered in Viśvalakṣman<sup>3</sup> accompanied by muttering the verses. The Ājya and Prāṇa Śāstras are taken from the Viśvajit<sup>4</sup>. The Śāstras of

<sup>1</sup> Sāyana explains that although the Śāndheni verses are not part of the Soma sacrifice itself, yet they are used in the animal sacrifice which forms a part of it and so are in place here. He quotes Mīmamsā Sūtra, III, 1, 18, 9 *anarthakyaś cā tad aṅgata*. They are to be said after the anointing of the animal by the Adhvaryu, according to Āpastamba. Cf. also his Vajrasamhitā, 1 and 2 (S B E, XXX, 319, 345). For the gen., cf. Caland, *Altindisches Zauberritual*, p. 18, n. 2, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 5, 4. III, 1, 1, 3.

<sup>2</sup> There are in the Darśapernamaseqi, see Hilbrandt, *Neu und Vollmondsopfer*, pp. 74 sq., fifteen verses beginning with RV, III, 17, 1 (cf. Oldenberg, S B E, XLVI, 199, Bergaigne, *Recherches sur l'histoire de la liturgie védique*, p. 19), see Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, III, 8, 2, 1. There are only eleven separate verses, but the first and last are each thrice repeated. In the Viśvavati the fifteen are extended into twenty one by the interpolation of six verses beginning with RV, III, 17, 5. These are inserted before the second last verse, RV, V, 28, 5. Then four more verses, beginning with RV, VIII, 44, 1, are added before this verse to make up the twenty-five. The Śaṅkhayana here ignores these verses. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 14, gives the number as 17. See a list in Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 2, 7. The construction acc. for nom. is remarkable and is not a mark of late or careless style, for these irregularities and the use of numerals are found in the Mantras (e.g. *saṁśṭa rinam, śatam pūrṇāḥ*, cited by Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 486 c) and in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 48, 9 *satṛiṣṭaṁ satvāna aruḥ*, while in VII, 2, 7, *parvatarah antas aruḥ ca śatāny aḥṛta* occurs (see Aufrecht, p. 418). Above, III, 2, 4, 3, 8, occurs *satṛinīlatam sahasram* while Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 1 has *satṛinīlatam akapadib* which examples all appear to be transfers of accusative for nominative, though the possibility of their being new stems is a cannot be denied (especially as the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa actually has *trayastrīṇalāṭya*, a transfer to the *i* declension). Cf. Introd., p. 56. The idiom has hardly been adequately noticed in Dehnbach, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 82.

<sup>3</sup> The Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 1, prescribes a bull for Indra and a goat for Prajapati. The Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 7, mentions also a *śavanyā paṭu*, see Hilbrandt *Relig. Literatur*, pp. 125, 126. Cf. also Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 2, 17. *Upamā* means not silence but so as not to be overheard, see Sāyana's quotation, *harṇasvāślabhim manasprayogam*, and Āpastamba Vajrasamhitā, 9, 11 and 113 (S B E, XXX, 319 and 345), where the Śāndhenis are not *upamā* but *antara* (see note on 11).

<sup>4</sup> For the Ājya see I, 1, 1. The Prāṇa consists of seven *brāṇas*, I, 1, 3-4, preceded by the *puruṣas*, *Ṣaṣṭa agreṇa yajñāḥ*, etc., Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 10, 9. The *puruṣas* are also given in Schellelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, as *khulu*, V, 6.

the Hotrakas are taken from the Caturvimśa rite<sup>1</sup>. In the morning pressing the Brāhmanīcchamsin should add the verses, beginning, 'The busy moving ones' (RV, X, 153, 1) and at the midday pressing the verses, 'Of this strong youthful one drink' (RV, X, 160, 1)<sup>2</sup>. The tristich which forms the strophe begins, 'The buffalo in the bowls, the barley-mixed' (RV, II, 22, 1), the tristich forming the antistrophe consists of the three verses, 'Indra, come hither to us from far away' (RV, I, 130, 1), 'For to Indra heaven, the wise one, bowed' (RV, X, 127, 1), and, 'To him a song excelling' (RV, X, 133, 1)<sup>3</sup>. The Marutvatya Śāstra is taken over from the Caturvimśa and extended by the hymns, 'Fair has been my effort, singer' (RV, X, 27, 1), 'Drink the Soma for which in anger thou breakest' (RV, VI, 17, 1), 'With what splendour' (RV, I, 165, 1), and, 'Indra, with the Maruts' (RV, III, 48, 1)<sup>4</sup>. The Marutvatya Śāstra ends with the hymn, 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV, X, 53, 1). At the end of the Marutvatya Śāstra, the Hotr, leaving his place by the incomplete route,<sup>5</sup> offers three oblations in the Agnidh's fire with a ladle of *udumbāra* wood (accompanying them with the verses) —

<sup>1</sup> The Hotrakas are the Mātravaruna, Brāhmanīcchamsin and Aśvika. In the Agnistoma their Śāstras begin with RV, III, 62, 16, VIII, 17, 1, III, 12, 1, respectively. In the Caturvimśa they begin with RV, V, 68, 3, I, 4, 1, VIII, 72, 13, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> The Mahāvrita differs in these points even from the Caturvimśa. Sayana leaves it undecided whether the passages extend to five verses, or only to one verse by the *parikhāta*, *pram padagrahana*, for which see Āśvalayana Śrāuta Sūtra, I, 1, 17.

<sup>3</sup> These verses are apparently to precede the Śāstra of the Brāhmanīcchamsin at the midday pressing. The word *stāhrya* is used because the verses correspond to those used in the Saman corresponding to the Śāstra, cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p. 103. The Śaikhayana Śakha ignores the Śāstras of the Hotrakas. The reference to the midday pressing is out of order.

<sup>4</sup> For the Marutvatya Śāstra of the Hotr at the midday pressing, see I, 2, 1 and 2. In the Agnistoma it begins with RV, VIII, 68, 1-3, and VIII, 2, 1-3. The Caturvimśa contains alterations, and the Mahāvrita adds the hymns enumerated. *Alana* (found in VS, TS, &c.) must mean *satara* as Sayana has it here. Cf. *Antareya Brāhmana*, V, 4, 12, where Sayana renders *satara* as Friedländer, on Śaikhayana Aranyaka, I, 3, suggests the sense 'scheme' for it. In RV, II, 1, 10, *atīśā* = 'expander', cf. my *Śaikhayana Aranyaka*, p. 3, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Sayana here (cf. Ānartya on Śaikhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, VI, 13, 7. VII, 7, 4, Āśvalayana Śrāuta Sūtra, V, 19, 8, VI, 5, 1, and comm.) explains that the *samsthānamcarah* is when, after the completion of the pressing, the Hotr departs from the *sahas* by the west, the *visamsthāna* is when, before the pressing is finished, he leaves by the eastern side. The Śaikhayana Śrāuta Sūtra XVII, 12 gives eight oblations on the *agnadhrya* instead of three there and ten in the *margalya*. The Mantras are quite different. See XVII, 11, 1-4. The first is a long prose Mantra, the second to the seventh *madh* Mantras, and the eighth consists of a couple of verses, the first in *samsthāna*, the second a *gayatri* in strongly marked iambic metre of an archaic type, neither of which verses has, according to Bloomfield's *Vedic Canon*, any parallel. After reciting the verses, he puts down the ladle *yathayatanam*, departs by the way he came, and in front of the *sahas* to the north of the *stuti*, facing the

'Indra, Bhṛhaspati, Soma, and the goddess, Vac, have aided me'<sup>10</sup> May Mitra and Varuna, Heaven and Earth, and me when first I call || 1 ||

'May the Ādityas, the all gods, and the seven anointed Kings,' Vayu, Pāśan, Varuna, Soma, Agni, Sūrya, with the constellations, may they help me || 2 ||

'May the fathers protect me, and || this universe, and the children of Prṣni, the Maruts, with their splendour, ye who have Agni as your tongue and are worthy of sacrifice, may ye gods, hearing our cry, protect us || 3 ||'

He offers ten oblations on the *maryajya* altar<sup>11</sup> to the south, the last of which he first divides into four and deposits to the north of the fire. In the middle of the day, after the carrying forth of the fire, the *maryajya* fire is made

east, he mutters the *parṇamadāḥ yajñāḥ, vāg ayur viśvayur viśvān ayur aky eva ādipreṣṭi viśvatha ideo maghavan ideo sti* (cf. above, p. 263) after which he adores the several members of the fire altar conceived in human form (XVII, 12, 6-13 6). For the Parṇamads themselves, cf. my *Saṅkhyāyana Āranyaka*, p. 4, Eggeling *S B E*, XLII, 288, n. 2, and for the meaning of *āmad*, Lanman in Whitney's *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 158. The Hotṛ goes north to the Agnidh's fire (For Agnidh, cf. Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLII, 189, and Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 18 n. 6).

<sup>10</sup> Or 'may they aid me', as Sayana takes it. He thinks *parṇamadam* is an epithet of *Dyauprithās* or *Mitruvaruṇas*.

<sup>11</sup> Sayana explains this by the list in Taittiriya Āranyaka I, 7, *arṇo bhṛhaspāḥ pātaraḥ pātaraḥ 1 svarṇaḥ jyotiṣman 1 bhṛgūḥ 1 te arṇas sarvā devān āśāpanti* ! This may be right, otherwise one might expect || to mean the seven Ādityas. No doubt the seven Ādityas set the model || in the later theory of seven suas, whose names are variously given (cf. seven Ṛsis, seven Hotṛs, seven sounds &c., Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLII, 125), see Visnu Purana, VI, 2, Hopkins, *Great Epics of India* p. 475. Rajadralala reads in the text *mā nu*, which is certainly wrongly accented and seems not quite as likely as *manu* in view of the *anu* elsewhere used. The Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 8, 2 has *anu tvendro madaty anu Bhṛhaspātāḥ | anu Soma anu Agnir av i | anu tva viśve devā āvāntu | anu sapta rājānā yā utōkṣitvāḥ | anu te dātṛvīdrumā āśṛtām | anu dyauprithās vāśatambhū | sūryo dhokṣir anu tvatatu | can dṛdha nḍhātṛar anu t'vratu* ! Note the different reading *utō āśṛitvāḥ* ! The text appears from Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 973<sup>a</sup>, to occur in *hāṭhaka Samhita*, XLVII, 9 d, which has (9 c) *śūryo 'hokṣir anu tvatatu*, confirm of *manu* against Mitra's *ma nu* (which is followed in the *Concordance*, p. 1028<sup>b</sup>), and (9 b) *anu Soma anu Agner avū*, and (9 a) *anu tvendro madaty anu Bhṛhaspātāḥ*, thus presenting only one line as against the two lines of the Āranyaka and the Brāhmaṇa. In the next verse *yē agnirjñitū utō va yajātṛaḥ* is a tag found in RV, VI, 52, 13 c, and in the other Samhitas (Bloomfield, p. 795<sup>b</sup>), the other three *paśas* seem as yet unparalleled. The series of prose Mantras below is also (see Index II) unique.

<sup>12</sup> In the middle of the *sadas* and the *āśvārāḥ* there is a space from north to south. The *agnidhīya* altar is at the north, the *maryajya* at the south. With *catargrāhitaḥ, aṅgān* must be understood see Āpastamba, Yajñopaniṣad 195 (*S B E*, XX, 341) cf. *catargrāhitaḥ yajñāḥ*, Taittiriya Āranyaka, I, 2, *catargrāḥ yāṣṭva aṅgāḥ*, Āitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 10, 2, \*gokṣam. VI, 11, but the construction is very awkward. Throughout the terms *dakṣas* and *uttara* are ambiguous. For the *sadas* the priests' tent, cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, III, 5 3 5, and Eggeling's note.

to kindle.<sup>13</sup> (The offering is made in n) when it is covered up, and either to the east, the north, or the north-east side. (The verses used are as follows):—

‘May I become unassailable like fire; may I become firmly rooted like the earth || 1 ||

‘May I become unapproachable<sup>14</sup> like the sky; may I become unassailable like the heaven || 2 ||

‘May I become without a superior like the sun; may I become renewed like the moon || 3 ||

‘May I become renewed like mind; may I be multiplied like the wind<sup>15</sup> || 4 ||

‘May I become one’s own like the day<sup>16</sup>; and dear like night || 5 ||

‘May I become born again like kine; may I become glorious<sup>17</sup> like a pair || 6 ||

‘Mine be the flavour of water and the form of plants || 7 ||

‘May I become widespreading<sup>18</sup> like food, and lordly like the sacrifice || 8 ||

‘May I become like the Brahman in the world, and like the Kṣatriya for prosperity || 9 ||

‘When, O Agni, this assembly is gathered (RV., X, 11, 8)<sup>19</sup> || 10 ||’

<sup>13</sup> The idea seems to be that the fire is kept in from the time it is lighted on the *andryditya* altar but is now ‘wakened’ *frakerts* in this use is first found in the Śeṣota Sūtras, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 112.

<sup>14</sup> The attraction of *anasyam* is curious, but is paralleled in RV., I, 65, 5: *patir nā ramā d hūir nā prihū girir nā bhūyā* (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 56), and below, *mana vaspurvaṃ, annam ita vidhāt, gota ita pumarābhavāḥ*, and in the case of the verb, RV., V, 15, 8: *dyumanto arāyo graṇoveryaṇe bhāt*, Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 417. Cf. also Taittiriya Aranyaka, VIII, 6; Weber, *Jud. Stud.*, II, 222, n. For a series of words with *bhūyasam*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 20 and 21.

<sup>15</sup> *yathā mana uttarottaram abhiorādhikantāyā prayatamenam tat tatatphalaprāptiā nānam rāpav prapadyate . . . yathā vasyr asūbhodimūc samutratirudideśe tū itajam uttarottarabhiorādhīyā sangharūpo bhavati* (Sāyana).

<sup>16</sup> Sāyana renders *svāḥ* as wealth. The day gives wealth by permitting mercantile operations. Emendation to *svāḥ* is easy but improbable. Cf. the curious *svāḥ* in RV., I, 77, 5 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 88), *yakṣam ita*, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 28. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 140. Night gives rest to the weary (Sāyana), note *prayo not priyā*.

<sup>17</sup> This must be the sense though the expression *maritayāḥ*, ‘glories,’ is curious. Kine have offspring yearly, and pairs (e.g. Umā and Mahādevī, Lakṣmī and Nārāyaṇa) are glorious (Sāyana).

<sup>18</sup> The reading *vidhāt* is certain, but both Rājendralīla and the Ānandāśrama edition read in the commentary *vidhāt*, and Sāyana may have so read, but this is not necessary. For a converse case, cf. V, 2, 2, when Rājendralīla reads *svāḥ* for *ramāḥ*. The next Mantra offers considerable difficulty. Sāyana renders as the Brahman in the world and *kratvam rājyaṃ gajātādityam adhipatē*, apparently taking *itryam* as a genitive (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, II 349, 351). But the parallelism of the sentence calls urgently for a locative which gives far sense, ‘in point of wealth.’ The speaker desires (a) renown, (b) wealth. Only the exact force of the locative varies in the two cases.

<sup>19</sup> The last oblation is accompanied by a RV. verse



(In this stanza) the three words *atra*, *viśhajīṣha*, and *vīṣha* are not in accordance with the Rgveda text<sup>10</sup>

Standing there he worships the sun,<sup>11</sup> turning so as to keep his right side towards ॥ as it turns, with these verses, omitting the cries of *śiṣha*,<sup>12</sup> and with the verse, 'Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet. Drink this butter draught. This is sweet, this is sweet.' He then instructs the maidservants,<sup>13</sup> who carry full pailers, six in front, three behind, (saying), 'Walk three times from left to right round this altar and this pail of water, smearing your right thighs with your right hands, and saying, "Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet"'

<sup>10</sup> This must mean that in the rite the RV verse is to be altered by reading in *śloka* 3 *ratnaṁ atra viśhajīṣha svadhīpāḥ* for *ratnaṁ ca yad viśhajīṣi*, and in *śloka* 4, *bhāgim no atra rasamanāṁ vīṣha* for *vīṣaḥ*. Śāyana adds that these alterations are improper, just as the alteration *vidhāḥ* for *vydhatu* in *Āyazpitar no havir vīdhatu*, Taittirīya Saṁhitā, I, 2, 2, VI, 2, 3, Maitrīyaṇi Saṁhitā, I, 2, 2, III, 6, 4. The *vī* is not in Bloomfield. But this is not implied in the Āranyaka. The verse occurs in Atharvaveda, XVIII, 1, 26, and Maitrīyaṇi Saṁhitā, IV, 14, 15, but in neither place so altered. Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, pp. 43<sup>b</sup>, 749<sup>b</sup>) also can merely quote Śāyana's view: Perhaps the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is meant. A different case occurs in IV *Indram dhadāya vīṣhaḥ havimāhe* when *havimāhe* is added (as in Mahā Brāhmana Upaniṣad 7, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 210<sup>d</sup>) to the first three words which are found in RV, VIII 3 5 d. But the Mahānārāyaṇa verses are not part of the RV and their occurrence is not parallel to this remarkable case.

<sup>11</sup> This is done later in the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka I, 5, where the words are almost identical, *atrasaṁ vīṣhaṁ adityam upastīṣate*. The Mantra is quite different, see Śrauta Sūtra, XI II, 13, 9, 10. For the following see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka*, pp. 26 sq.

<sup>12</sup> The offerings are accompanied as usual by the cry *śuk*. These are omitted. For the rule, cf. Apastamba Yaṅyapariśiṣṭa 87 (S B E, XXX, 339).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XI II 14 where apparently deliberately the direction is from right to left (*apradakṣiṇaḥ* *am*), though the words said are alike, *haṁ maḥa 3 idam madhu śāṁṁ madhu*. The dance is clearly a sun and vegetation spell, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* III, 103. These and the other ceremonies are all mentioned in the other parallel passages, Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 10, 12, IV, 1-3, Tāndya Brāhmaṇa, V, 5, 6. Kaṣṭhaka, XXXIV, 5, Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 3, Taittirīya Saṁhitā VII, 5, 9 and 10, Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 7. These versions differ in many details, the most important rite which is mentioned in neither of the Rgvedic works is the struggle of an Ārya and a Śūdra for a round skin, which represents the sun (cf. Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, pp. 444, 506, Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1904 pp. 297 sq.). It is noteworthy that in Lāṭyāyana, IV 2, 18, where the words repeated are like those in Śāṅkhāyana the form *vataryak* also occurs. So Dṛaḥyayana Taittirīya Saṁhitā, VII 5, 10, has *guyantaryak*. The direction there is also *pradakṣiṇam*. After the eight *ajya* libations in the *agnidhriya* fire, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, I 4, come the *parimand*. They are twenty five in number and are followed by seven *stotriyas* named *adityasā samana*, *bhūtechadum samana*, *krāṣa anukrāṣa*, *payas*, *arīṣa*, and *arkīṣaṣṭa*. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 2, 2, 8, 9 contains a somewhat parallel version, see Eggeberg, S B E XLII, 288, n 2, and thus again (cf. Introduct., p. 36) agrees with the Śāṅkhāyana against the Āitareya. These *samana* are called *devachandamāni*, Śāṅkhāyana I, 5 and are followed by *yajus*. Then comes an adoration of the members of the fire (see here V, 1, 2), and of the sun, and the Hotr declares that the 'great one has united with the great

2. 'When the singing of the *stotra* has been requested, then do ye cast down the water in three places, on the northern altar, on the *mārjālīya* altar, and the rest within the enclosure' <sup>1</sup> Having gone away so as to keep the *mārjālīya* fire on his right, <sup>2</sup> he stands before the sacrificial post in front of the fire, with face to the west, and worships the head of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Gāyatra which is thy head;' then, returning by the way he came, <sup>3</sup> with face to the north, he worships the right side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Rathantara which is thy right side.' Then passing to the west of the tail of the fire, <sup>4</sup> with face to the east, he worships the left side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Bṛhat which is thy left side.' Then on the west <sup>5</sup>

one, <sup>1</sup> I = Agni with Tṛiśatī, 'the god with the goddess,' i.e. Vāyu with Antarikṣa, 'Brahman (nest,) with Brāhmanī' (see Introductory, p. 68, n. 1), i.e. Āditya with Dyauṣ. On this follows (1, 6) a Vāisāmitra legend (cf. Astaveya, II, 2, 3) to explain these identifications. For the use of *apsa* + *śrīd*, cf. the famous passage in the Mahābhārata, I, 3, 25 (Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 480, 481), where an ape *upatisthate* to warm himself, but a man *upatisthate* in reverence.

<sup>2</sup> For *antarvedi*, cf. Astaveya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 33, 2; *antahparidhī*, Bṛhaddevatā, VII, 98; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 312. This belongs of course to the end of the preceding Khanda, and it is difficult to see why it has been separated in Śāyana's text. *altars mārjālīya* means the *agnidārīya* fire, which was used for the same purpose.

<sup>3</sup> This describes the worship of the fire altar in its simplest bird shape, head, two wings, tail, and body. In Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 13, the *śamans* and the order differ, being (1) *pūrvārtha* with Gāyatra, (2) right side with Rathantara, (3) left side with Bṛhat, (4) *madhya* with Vāmadevya, (5) tail with Vajñesajālā. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 1, 2, 35 and 39, X, 1, 2, 8, and Eggeling's summary (based on this passage and Śākhāyana), *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 283, n. 1, Latyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 11, 5, where as here the body is placed last, but which agrees as to the *śamans* with Śākhāyana and also with Dīkhyāyana, and in which the sprinkling of water in three parts also occurs. The *Śamans* referred to will be found as follows, *gṛyātram* in *trāṣṭa stoma*, Sāmaveda, II, 146-148, 263-265, 800-803 (or II, 8, 4, see *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 178), *rathantara* in *pañcādaka stoma*, *ibid.*, II, 30, 31, *brhat* in *ṣṇādīśa stoma* *ibid.*, II, 159-160, *vajñesajālā* in *pañcāśīśa stoma*, *ibid.*, II, 833-835, *śhakra* in *śhakraśīśa stoma*, *ibid.*, II, 460-462. For the *Śamans* of II, 3, 4. For a drawing of the *agnidārīya* see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 235.

<sup>4</sup> He had gone from the *mārjālīya* in the south to the east side of the *trīdāgni* and he now returns to the south. *Rathantara* = unusual, but it is supported by all the MSS. Latyāyana and Śākhāyana have *rathantṛaya*.

<sup>5</sup> It is not clear why he should not go round to the north, but all that is done is to go to the end of the west or tail side, when looking east, along the left side, he utters the Mantra.

<sup>6</sup> *palati* may simply mean 'next', or, as Śāyana takes it, refer to the place where the Hotṛ stands. Apparently the difference between this and his former position is that he stands directly behind the tail, instead of going past it. This account of his movements corresponds on the whole with that of the ceremony of the Śatarodīya, which has analogies in the Mahāvratā (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 1, 2, 44). In it, according to the Śatapatha, IX, 1, 2, 35 sq., the *Śamans*, (1) *gṛyātram*, (2) *rathantara*, (3) *brhat*, (4) *vāmadevya*, (5) *vajñesajālā*, and (6) *pañcāśīśa*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right wing, (3) left wing, (4) body, (5) tail, (6) breast; according to Latyāyana, I, 5, 11, which very closely follows the order of

of the fire, with face to the east, he worships the tail with the words, 'Honour to the Bhadrā which is thy tail and thy support.' Then on the south of the tail he worships the body with the words, 'Honour to the Rājāna which is thy body.'

3. He returns to the seat as he went<sup>1</sup> The swing has already been made ready.<sup>2</sup> Having cleansed the two posts, the ropes, and the cross beam, and having taken them by the road called *firika*,<sup>3</sup> having gone round to the left the Agnadh's altar,<sup>4</sup> (having brought them within) the seat by the east door (he places the implements<sup>5</sup>) to the left of all the altars. The planks of the swing are made of *udumbara* or of *palāśa*, or of both. There should be three planks worked on both sides, or two, and a like number of sharp-pointed sticks. The

movements in this Aitareya passage, the (1) *gayatram*, (2) *rathantarām*, (3) *brhat*, (4) *yajña-yajñīyam*, (5) *Vamadevya*, and (6) *Prājāpatihrdya*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right side, (3) left side, (4) tail, (5) right arm pit, and (6) left arm pit. Cf. also the elaborate ceremonial of the *parimadaś* at the Mahāvratā as described in Śatapatha, X, 1, 2, 9, Śākhāyana Āranyaka, II, 4 (with Friedländer's note p. 37), and the similar use after the beginning of the *pṛsthā śloka* of the *parimadaś* (*prana*, *apana*, *avatapaksu*, *Prājāpater hrīdaya*, *Vasūtharīya nīlata*, *sattvīyārthi*, *lōka* and *anulōka*, *yama*, *ayur*, *navastakha*, *ryasya samāna*) in the worship of the parts of the altar in Tandyā Brāhmaṇa, V, 4, 1-13. Latyayana Śrāuta Sūtra, III, 9, 1 sq. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, 1, 2, 6 5. In the Mahāvratā Saman the parts of the bird are head, right wing, left wing, tail, and trunk only (Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, xxvii). The whole conception is clearly borrowed (cf. Introd., p. 50) from the altar in the Agnicayana which gave origin to the mystic doctrines of the Ādhvaryus (see especially Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI-8), and of which the Mahāvratā is an adaptation by the Hoṭṛs. In Yajussneya Sampluta, XII, 4, the *trīṣṭi* is the head, the *gayatram* the eyes, *brhat* and *rathantarām* the wings, the hymn the soul, the *yajus* the name, the metres the limbs, the *Vamadevya* the body, the *yajñayajñīyam* the tail. For the relation of *saman* and words, cf. Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XXXVIII, 439 sqq., 464 sq., Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 143 sq., and see Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 180, n. 2, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 276 sq. The *Vamadevya* is based on Samaveda, II, 32, 33, the *Yajñayajñīya* on Samaveda, II, 33.

<sup>1</sup> He comes back to the seat near the *moryāṭīya* fire, which he left to worship the *cūya* altar. The expression occurs several times in the Śrāuta Sūtra. For the eight altars see Eggeling *S B E*, XXVI, 148, n. 4 and the plan on p. 475, followed by Caland and Henry, *L'Agnostoma*, Hillebrandt *Nieuw und Veldmanhopfer*, p. 191.

<sup>2</sup> By the Ādhvaryus. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 32.

<sup>3</sup> This is the name of the passage between the *uthara* and *cātaka*, Śākhāyana Śrāuta Sūtra, V, 15, 2, &c., Maitrayani Sampluta, III, 8, 10. The action is rendered intelligible by a glance at the plan in Eggeling.

<sup>4</sup> The *pari* of *parivrajya* must refer to circumambulation. The meaning of the phrase is probably given by Śākhāyana Śrāuta Sūtra, XVII, 11, 4 *parvaya devaṅguṣṭham prapa dyotitāreṇa dhīryam dhīryam parvaya*, though the *pāruṣā dīra* here is otherwise explained. The idea is, he goes round the altar from right to left, probably. Cf. also *ibid.*, V, 14. The sentence is so elliptical as to be unintelligible without Sayana's *parvaya*. Śākhāyana, XVII, 7, 11, is much more simple.

<sup>5</sup> The verb must be gathered from *atyadodāśa* below, strictly speaking the next sentences are parenthetical and this sentence is continuous with *dakṣiṇottare āhūne nūbhīya*.

swing should be a yard in size from east to west, its cross breadth should be a yard less a hand, the points of its (planks) should be to the north, and they should be fastened together by sticks with their points east. Having inserted the posts in the earth to the north and south, around the seat of the Hotr, he spreads the cross beam over them so that it is on a level with the worker's face.<sup>1</sup> Holes are (bored) in the corners of the planks of the swing. He fastens the planks above by means of the ropes, the right one on the south, the left on the north.<sup>2</sup> The ropes should be of *darbha* grass, and with three strands,<sup>3</sup> one rope to

<sup>1</sup> In the Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 10, 7 and 8, the height is measured by the head of the Hotr, or if he is small his outstretched arms. Ibid., 4, 6, shows that both the planks and the cross beam have the points north. For the construction with *kartuk* dependent on *ayudh*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 2316. Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 113) gives many classical examples. For *abhiśat* with accus., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 183. It is found in Mantra, but more often in Brāhmaṇa. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 88. For *uttareṇa* with accus., cf. Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ in Veda*, pp. 207 ff., see Laebich, *Deus Beir*, XI, 184. Delbrück and Gaedicke seem right in explaining the use as derived from the accus. with *antar* and *antarā*. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 273, offers no explanation. In V, 1, 1, we find *uttarato 'guck*, in V, 1, 2, *dakṣiṇataḥ guchayata* with the more natural adnominal genitive. But in V, 1, 2, *aparṇa* has the accus. In Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VII, 3, *antarṇa* has the gen., in the Sūtra, the acc. The measures are dubious, see Hopkins, *J A O S*, LVIII, 243.

<sup>2</sup> The Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 10, 14, 15, explains that the right rope is tied to the north of the south post, the left to the south of the north post, i.e. inside the posts, just as in a modern swing. The point of view is of course facing east, with the south on the right and north on the left.

<sup>3</sup> The use of *triṅguḥ* and *dvyaṅguḥ* with different senses of *guṇa* is awkward, but appears clearly so meant. Sayana points out that the rope as doubled would be  $1\frac{1}{2}$  fathoms in length of which only a yard would be used by the rope passing under the plank (above *śūmatraḥ* from *śrūmatraḥ*). There would thus be plenty of rope available for the tying, as the top was only a man's height or less. Sayana takes *śaṃpāḍakṛim* as 'inclining to the left and right', i.e. the ropes should not go straight up. The only obscure point in this description of the tying on of the seat of the swing to the cross beam is *śaṃpāḍakṛim* since it is not at first sight obvious how this applies to the act of fastening ropes. It apparently must mean that after the rope has been passed under the seat of the swing the one end is rolled round the cross beam slanting to the right, the other (on the opposite side, of course) also slanting to the right and the ends then are tied across. Provided there was sufficient friction to keep the ropes from slipping this would seem to give a substantial knot (cf. *niṣṭarḍhya*). If this is so, we cannot accept Sayana's theory of *śaṃpāḍakṛim* and must fall back either on the view that the word means merely left (hand) rope and right (hand) rope, or take the epithet

\* It is very unlikely that both ends of the rope should have been brought to the same side of the cross beam. In that case *śaṃpāḍakṛim* would be rather less than more in point. Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 106, n.) points out that adjective *dvandvīya* are not unknown even in Sanskrit (cf. his *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 208), and (p. 32, n. 1) argues from Minil, VI, 2, 38 when *śāḍaśa* is given as a *dvandvīya* that the grammarians recognized such types. He (§ 107) gives classical examples of distributive *dvandvīya*.



over, or with ten (He should say) 'I produce thee with the *gayatri* metre I produce thee with the *anustubh* metre I produce thee with the *usubh* metre I produce thee with the *brhasti* metre I produce thee with the *pankti* metre. I produce thee with the *tristubh* metre I produce thee with the *jagati* metre. I produce thee with the *viraj* metre I produce thee with the *dvipada* metre I produce thee with the *atichandas* metre' Having gone through the metres according to the series of notes, he strikes the lute thrice, beginning from the foot with a branch of *udumbara* wood, fresh and still leafy, using the foot of it, (to the words) 'For up breathing I strike thee, for down-breathing I strike thee, for cross breathing I strike thee' But he should not say, 'I strike thee,' for other desires'. Then he hands over to the Saman singers the lute with the branch'. He places his two hands on the back plank (with the words), 'For creatures thee (I touch),' and pushes the swing to the east (with the words), 'Swing forward like the breath,' crosswise<sup>7</sup> (with the words), 'Swing crosswise for cross-breathing,' and back to himself (with the words) 'Swing like back breathing' He repeats the words *bhuk*, *bhuvah*, and *svah*<sup>8</sup> He then pushes the swing to the east' (with the words), 'For breath I push thee,' crosswise (with the words), 'For cross breathing I push thee,' and back to himself (with the words), 'For down-breathing I push thee' (With the words) 'May the Vasus mount thee with the *gayatri* metre, I mount after them,' he places his elbows on the back plank'. Then he should touch the front plank with his

mean each metre has four more syllables than its predecessor, viz 24, 28, 32, &c., and as Sayana takes it on Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 6, 6

<sup>7</sup> No doubt, as Sayana says a reference to a practice of other Śākhās, but not to the Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka or Śaṅkta Sūtra. For the words *audumbarāya*, &c., cf. *audumbarayardraya jātāya sapalāyā* in Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 13. For the construction, of the act of whole and part, e.g. AV, V, 8, 9 (cited by Speyer *Verbsche und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 20, Delbrück *Virgi Synt* I, 285) *enam marmam udhyā* when, however, according to Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda* the reading should be *marmam*, loc., though *marmam* appears also in the Aṣṭadhyāyī edition *samrat* 1957. Somewhat analogous cases appear in Speyer, I 83, Gaebeke, *Der Accusativ* p. 268. Or *utidalema* may refer to the lute.

<sup>8</sup> In Śāṅkhayana it is the Udgātṛ who has throughout to deal with the lute.

<sup>9</sup> Clearly the *vyāna* is a locath at right angles to *prāṇa* and *apāna*. This is an unusual conception of it, and is not mentioned in Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 251, E. T., p. 279.

<sup>10</sup> Sayana says that the repetition of these three words denotes a desire that the three worlds be established by the threefold moving of the swing. They are used in Lāṭyāyana IV, 1, 4 in connexion with the playing of the lute. Cf. also Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 339. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 432, n., Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I 162.

<sup>11</sup> The *sva* denotes that the action is as before, only the verses being different (Śāyana).

<sup>12</sup> In Śāṅkhayana, XVII, 16 he touches the swing with his breast and then alternately he puts his right and left side over with Mantras almost identical with those here save that *sva* is prefixed and each ends with a dative *svayāya* &c. He then plants his two feet to the east.

hands separately,<sup>11</sup> like a serpent about to creep. He should touch the middle plank with his chin, or if there are two<sup>12</sup> the point of joining of the two. (With the words), 'May the Rudras mount thee with the *fristubh* metre, I mount after them,' he lays his right thigh<sup>13</sup> (over the seat). (With the words), 'May the Ādityas mount thee with the *jagats* metre, I mount after them,' (he lays) his left thigh. (With the words), 'May the All-gods mount thee with the *anustubh* metre, I mount after them,' he mounts (the swing)<sup>14</sup>. To the west of his own altar he places his right foot pointing  $\equiv$  the east, and then his left<sup>15</sup>. If the former is tired, then the latter, if the latter, then the former. But the two together must never be off the ground. The Hotrakas sit down on bundles of grass, and so does the Brahman priest. The Udgatr sits on a stool of *udumbara* wood. If he has to leave for any absolutely necessary action, then having set one to guard, he descends towards the east, and having carried out the exact business he

Then he sits crosswise on the swing and touches the back of it with the Mantra, *Prājapati tvarehatu yayuḥ preṇbhayatu*. This act is preceded and followed by three expirations and three inspirations. The Mantras of the Udgatr on mounting his seat in Latyayana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12, 8, are like those in Śaṅkhayana omitting *arho 'a*, but Latyayana, III, 12, 9, permits them to be reduced to simply *gayatrīna ita chandācrahanti*, &c. In Latyayana the verses are said by the Udgatr. Ibid., 10-12. Gantama adds a fifth stoma with *viriyena*, Dhanam-jayya has four, and Śaṅkhya only three.

<sup>11</sup> The Anandastama edition reads *yathā ās*, which is nonsense. The reading of Rājendralāla is that clearly of Sayana, who takes the point of comparison to lie in the fact that he raises his hands as a snake about to creep raises its head. *Nana* must be an adverb meaning 'separately'. It might possibly be suggested that it meant here 'without', a sense ascribed by Pāṇini, II, 3, 32, but even then the comparison with the snake would have little point. For the use of *nānā*, cf. Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 7, 8, 10, XVII, 3, 3, Latyayana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 3, 9 (= Latyayana Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 2, 8) *nana papakṛtya* Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 3, 10 *mandāpi satī dāsvatī*, Manava Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 18, and other passages in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 545<sup>b</sup>. For a similar metaphor, cf. Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 6, 3 *yathā lakṣmī upaśṛīyan*.

<sup>12</sup> There may be two or three, V, 1, 3. They are fastened by the *śūcis*.

<sup>13</sup> In Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 16, 1, occurs, *dakṣiṇam āgām atmano 'śikaram*, where Govinda explains by *ārdayat gr̥hāḥ kurvan*, but Sayana here talks of *preṇbhārohanam*, and the sense requires the meaning 'lays over', which is probably meant also in the Śaṅkhayana passage, as pointed out by Friedlander on Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, I, 7. Cf. Introd., p. 67.

<sup>14</sup> The same series of gods and metres occurs in the Vajasaneyi Samhita XI, 60, 63, Taittiriya Samhita, IV, 1, 5, Muśtrayana Samhita, II, 7, 6, Tāndya Mahabrahmana, VII, 6, Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, XI, 8. Cf. Śatapatha Brahmana, VI, 5, 3 (*agnicayana*) X, 4, 17, and see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 168 and cf. the Rājāsūya verses, Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 6, 1-4.

<sup>15</sup> The exact sense of this is taken by Sayana to be that the feet are to be used alternately, and this seems correct, though it is not said exactly that the two cannot ever be both on the ground at once. They must not be both off the ground of I, 2, 4. For the gen with *palcat*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmana, VIII, 10, 9 *etya gr̥ham palcat gr̥hasyagñer upacchīyannvarabdhaya pīṭṭv antaś śaṅkṣma caruṇḍatīḥ tīrṇa apyadhāt anantīḥ prapadāḥ palcat*. This corrects Speiser's remark (*Vedic and Sanskrit Syntax*, § 83), followed by Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 743, that *palcat* is not so found before the Śrauta Sūtras.

should mount again in the manner above set forth, omitting the utterance {of *bhūh, bhuvah and svar*}<sup>16</sup>

■ He instructs the Prastotr, 'In the *pañcavimśa stoma* proclaim the first *prahāra* when either three verses remain to be said, or two and a half<sup>1</sup> or twelve and a half<sup>2</sup> Jatūkarnya holds that this should be done when there remain twelve and ½ half verses. When the Prastotr has spoken, he repeats<sup>3</sup> (the verse), 'Thou art a bird with fair wings I shall speak forth this word, which will declare much,<sup>4</sup> fare far, produce much, gain much, effect more than much,

<sup>16</sup> Sayana takes *apapaya vṛta* as the form. It may equally be *apapaya avṛta*, *vṛta* being more usual in this sense, as in *Manava Grhya Sutra*, II, 4, 2 9, 8, *Asvilsyana Śrauta Sutra*, V, 11, 4, 5 &c.; cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 460. If *avapayakarmine* is read the sense must be, 'If he should go for (to serve) some one who has something he must do on hand. At first sight this seems easier, but if *karmine* had been original it would hardly have been changed to *karmine* a less obvious construction, while the reverse of this process would be not unnatural. If *karmine* is read see for the formation which is rare in early texts, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 121, 122. For the dat., cf. Gaebeke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, p. 135, Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 177, 301.

<sup>1</sup> So Sayana explains *ardhatrityam*. The *prahāra* is repeated five times usually before the last *pada* of the verse, cf. Hallebrandt *Ritual Literature*, § 100 and ref. For the imperative in *īat*, signifying an action to be carried out after something else, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p. 363, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 570, 571. The dictum of Whitney that the benedictive sense of the imperative in *īat* was not exemplified, can only be supported on a very narrow interpretation of the word 'benedictive', not merely for classical Sanskrit (where it occurs often in *Jaina Kavya* texts) but also for Vedic. E.g. in RV III, 21, 2 *āgno vī palya brāhādāś vyādhīm no nēdā bhavātāś anu dyām* it is surely absurd to take *bhavātāś* as imperative as does Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 288) similarly in Wh. they's own example from RV *yād ārdhvaś śluha drāṣṇehā dhātāś* 'mayst is clearly the sense and may be himself uses in translating the example from the MDh *bhāvan prasādam karutāś*. Probably, therefore in denying the 'benedictive' sense, Whitney refers to that word in the narrowest sense of a blessing pronounced by some person who in the ordinary view is entitled to bless. This is so far borne out by the fact that Pāṇini, III, 1, 50 (*āstī ca*) is explained by the *Siddhāntakamandī* (following the *Kaṇva Vṛtta*) as *alīh prayoktū dharmaś alāstūh pātrader tyam alīh*. In these cases the benedictive is regularly used in Sanskrit e.g. *īat kīṃ anyāś āstamaś kevalam viropranyā bhūyāś* (Vikramorvāśī), or the king's formal *alīh*, e.g. *āstipantīm ca bhūyāt samapactatukhāś sāmgamāṃ yajamānam* (Ratnavālī), or the imperative (e.g. in the verse from the Ratnavālī just cited) in fact three imperatives occur, but in the early language at any rate I can find no certain example of *īat* so used. But the distinction between a wish and a blessing is evanescent.

<sup>2</sup> The *Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka* I, 8, and *Śrauta Sutra*, XVII, 17, give the *Mantras* in reverse order, and omit the *ukhātavyam*. For *suparno 's garuṣman* see *Vajrasaneyi Samhitā* XII, 4; *Śaṅkhayana* identifies this with *paśuṃ*, but see my *Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka*, p. 77, n. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Sayana interprets these epithets very inadequately, but it is most probable that they are all genuine including *svar vadītyantīm*, which has least MS authority. The *Ānandabrahma* edition considers Sayana's text defective but most probably he regarded some of the epithets as obvious, though perhaps he had not *svar vadītyantīm*. *Latītyam* has only after *vadītyantīm* *bahu karītyantīm* *bahu karītyam svar gamayītyantīm* *sva gamayītyam mām smān yajamānam*, see IV, 2, 10. So also *Drāhyayana*. *Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka* recognises *bahu karītyantīm* *bahur bhūyāś karītyantīm* *sva gamayītyantīm* *sva smān yajamānam* *vadītyantīm* only which resembles



which goes to heaven, which will declare heaven, fare to heaven, produce heaven, gain heaven, carry this sacrifice to heaven, and carry the sacrificer, me, to heaven'. The word 'sacrificer' applies only to one who has been consecrated, not to one not consecrated'. In the case of a friend of his, he should say 'carries N N to heaven', not 'will carry'. He then repeats the *ukthavijayas*,<sup>6</sup> and, 'Breath (is united) with speech, may I be united with speech. Eye united with mind, may I be united with mind. Hearing is united with the self, may I be united with the self. May I have greatness, glory, good fortune, enjoyment, the *śloha*<sup>7</sup> and the *stoma* verse, sound, renown, prosperity, fame, and fruition'.<sup>8</sup>

Latyayana's version given above. The Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 1, has *preman vacam vadisyami bahū karisyantim bahū karisyam bahū bhuyah svar gamisyantim svar gamisyam*. Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 642<sup>b</sup>) gives Latyayana and Śaṅkhyayana as having *svargam*, &c., instead of *svargam*, &c. but that this is quite wrong may be proved, not only by its inherent improbability but also by Śaṅkhyayana Āranyaka I 8 (the Āranyaka unluckily did not come to Bloomfield's notice), where occurs *svargam* by *esa* *ag gamisyantu bhavati*, see my note *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 304.

<sup>4</sup> i.e. not to the Hotṛ in an *ekaha* or *ahina*, but in a *sattrā*. Cf. V, 3, 3, 2, 1, and III, 2, 4, 2.

<sup>5</sup> This seems to be the same. If so this passage recognizes the performance for a friend against Śaṅkhyayana Āranyaka, I, 1, the case of an enemy is specially dealt with in that Āranyaka, I, 8, *namam* being said. The future is not to be used for the present as to be used to signify the immediate attainment of heaven (Sayana).

<sup>6</sup> The six Mantras, *ghṛāyo tu, ślokaḥ tu, śruvate tu, upaśrīvate tu, āśrūyas tu, āśrūyate tu*, says Sayana. Though Śaṅkhyayana does not mention the *ukthavijayas* here, they are frequently alluded to in the Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 9, 6, 10, 15, 19, 25, 10, 11, &c. See Sayana's list: Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra V, 9, 21, 10, 10, 14, 16, 13, 21, 18, 13, 20, 8, and cf. Eggeling, *S. B. E.* XXVI, 337. There is one for each of the Hotṛ's Sāstras.

<sup>7</sup> Sayana explains as the fruits of these parts of the Saman. The omission of the verb may be compared with V, 2, 2, 2, 13. In Taittiriya Āranyaka IV, 11, is *māyā dhāyā sutirjam* after a series of loc. Compare for the list, Śaṅkhyayana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 1, 10, *dhāgam me voco dhāgam me voco bhūtam me vocaḥ śrīgam me voco yāto me voco māyā dhāga māyā dhāgam māyā dhātā māyā śrīr māyā jāśā*. Schefelowitz, *Zur Stammbildung in dem indogermanischen Sprachem*, takes *dhāga* as equal to 'beauty', quoting RV, I, 141, 1, *dhā śtād dā edpūḥ dhāyā dāśatām dāśyā dhāgah śhāso yāto jānī*, III, 61, 10, AV XIX, 37, 1, VI, 69, 1, Śatapatha Brahmana, V, 4, 5, 1 and comparing Old Slavonic *blakati*, &c. These sentences it will be noted contain older forms of words and expressions than the ordinary Sūtra form or the mere liturgical direction, cf. Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance* p. viii, and V, 3, 2, 17. So *rug dāśa samasya trypātū* and *duḥam mahat* in V, 3, 2. A precise parallel is found in Taittiriya Āranyaka, IV, 11, *idm aḥm āyusa | idm prānāna | idm vācāta | idm ptyasa | idm gaupatyāna | idm rāya ptyāna | vy ānau*, &c. Śaṅkhyayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 1, has *idm vik prānāna sam aḥm prānāna*, and *sam cākṣur*, &c., as in the Aitareya, but *sam svāram*, &c., it omits.

After *stoma*, *śloka* may well be 'verse', or possibly 'hymn of praise'. Elsewhere it means, however, merely 'song'; e.g. *Udhadārayaka Upaniṣad*, I, 4, 7 (Kṛishṇa) 18 (Māṇḍiyanīya) *evam karim ślokaṁ vandate*, which appears to be the only Upaniṣadic passage with that sense (Jacob, *Concordance* p. 940).

<sup>8</sup> *Bhāṣyaśūktī* or *śloka bhāṣyāślokaṇa drushtavyah* (Sayana).

Having called<sup>9</sup> (to the Adhvaryu), he mutters the word 'speech'. There are three calls<sup>10</sup> (for the Hotr) at the beginning of the Śastra of the *nivid*, and of the concluding verse. The Adhvaryus<sup>11</sup> make sounds. On this day one<sup>12</sup> should give much food. They cause a warrior<sup>13</sup> to pierce a skin. They smite the earth drum and women play lutes<sup>14</sup>. There is intercourse of creatures,<sup>15</sup> and a conversation between a student and a courtesan. The Udgatrs sing various Samans for the Nrskevalya Śastra,<sup>16</sup> the Hotr begins with the strophe of the Rajana Saman<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> In Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra XVII 12 5 the *anuyoga* is *ayur aya vishvayam suham ayur aya eva hu drophe vishvatha vinda maghavan vinda it*. The call is *adhvarya sen nam*, Atitaya Brahmana III, 12 &c., Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 14. Garbe, *Ritual Literature*, pp 100-102. Caland and Henry, *L'Agnistoma* p 232.

<sup>10</sup> Not as in the *prakṛti* also with the *anuragas* and *dhayyas* (Soyana).

<sup>11</sup> *Karanyas* is little if any, more than a simple verb. Cf. epic examples in Holtzmann on Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1041, 1068. *Sponer Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 136. *Sanskrit Syntax* § 304. So in Pali and Prakrit. Miller *Pali Grammar*, p 107. This is a preliminary to the beginning of the Śastra. Presumably the words, like those mentioned below, are intended to frighten away demons &c. Cf. Cook *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1902, p 24. Farnell *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 31, Crooke, *Northern India*, p 196, my *Sankhayana Aranyaka* p 78.

<sup>12</sup> i. e. the *yajamana*.

<sup>13</sup> The ceremony is described at greater length in Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra XVII 15. The king or his representative pierces the skin with three arrows which are not allowed to penetrate through. The idea is clearly a rain spell. The arrows pierce the sky and bring down the waters the sky imprisons. This idea may explain the archer in the myth of the descent of Soma though the idea appears distorted there (Bloomfield *J A O S* XVI 22 sq.). For the *āte* and instr. of Gaidiche *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp 275 sq. Liebeck *Beis. Beitr.*, XI, 272 sq., Delbrück *Altindische Syntax* pp 225 226. *Vergl. Synt.* II 117 118 III 2, 4, 2 15.

<sup>14</sup> The drumming is performed on a raw hide stretched over a hole dug in the ground outside (the *vedi* by means of the tail of the sacrificial animal. Sankhayana XVII 5. There are also four or six ordinary drums used. The wives used various instruments. *ghatahakarav avagha tarikah kankas* & *dh pichara it* ibid. XVII 3 12. Another list partly the same in Latzyāna, IV, 2 1 8. Cf. Hillebrandt *Vel Myā* II 190. *J A O S* XXIII 309.

For a similar ceremony as to promote fertility, cf. Farnell *Cults of the Greek States*, III 80 103, I rather *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* pp 21 sq. my *Sankhayana Aranyaka* pp 82 sq.

<sup>15</sup> Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra XVII 6 1, 2 *atha sudravyam striparivraman banfakhatala ity upakalpayanti* | *to i etat puranam istannam na karyam* | Apastamba cited by Soyana, says *ullataryam tādityam im pūṣṭikāya magadhya ca parivrayanti* (al. *parivrayanti*) see \XI, 19. Cf. Taittiriya Samhita VII, 4, 9 4. The conversation of the student and courtesan is given in Latzyāna IV, 3 9-11, the *utkhana* in 17. Cf. Kapfka *Samhitā*, XXIV 5. Latzyāna Śrauta Sūtra XIII 3 v. Schroeder *Mysterium und Aktus* pp 161 sq. who overlooks the force of the plural (*caranti*) in the *haphala*, Oldenberg *Gott gel. Anz* 1909 p 77 n 1, my note, *J R A S*, 1909 p 205, n 2.

<sup>16</sup> Soyana explains that the Udgatrs sing their Samans first of all ending with the *nyaman* : *man* the first trisuch of which serves as the commencement of the Nrskevalya Śastra of the Hotr. On the verses cf. Oldenberg *Religion des Veda*, pp 383 sq. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 141 sq. 376 sq.

<sup>17</sup> The Latzyāna Śrauta Sūtra, which goes into further detail mentions also as part of the

6 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120),<sup>1</sup> 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV, X, 54), 'He groweth more for strength' (RV, VI, 30), and the three verses beginning, 'Thee, manliest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV, III, 51, 4), (are the commencement of the Śāstra) Here some say<sup>2</sup> that one should take from the body verses the two quarter-verses, 'Join with the sweet what is sweeter than sweet' (RV, X, 120, 3<sup>d</sup>), and 'The sweet with the sweet hast thou conquered' (ibid., 3<sup>d</sup>), and replace them with the wing quarter-verses, 'O Maghavan, O Indra, the strong steeds' (RV, VII, 33 2<sup>d</sup>), and 'O Indra, grant a cow, a chariot horse' (RV, VI, 46, 2<sup>d</sup>), and put in place of the latter those other two. He thus wins the profit of a cow<sup>3</sup> and

ceremonies a fight between an Ārya (Vaiśya) and a Śūdra for a skin which is compared with the sun and the appointment of persons to praise and criticize the acts of the priests, IV, 3, perhaps in order to avert the evil eye (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III 172), of the abuse of the Roman triumph. The first ceremony clearly shows the nature of the rite as a sun spell, which has many parallels in different parts of the world (Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1904, pp. 297-313), as Agastya on IV, 3 7, points out. It is discussed in Taittiriya Brāhmana, V, 2, 6, 7. For ritual *strophologia* as stimulating vegetation or serving a particular purpose, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 104, IV, 267, Frazer, *Golden Bough*, I<sup>st</sup>, 97, Crooke *Northern India* p. 193. v. Schroeder *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 309 sq.

<sup>1</sup> See I 3 3-8. This Āhanga deals with the body and the *sudakṣha* verse following it. It corresponds in Śākhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 1, and Śaṅkha Sūtra, XVIII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XVIII, 14 7, Āraṇyaka, II, 1, 11, omits the last two *padas* and does not replace them, but puts them before the *ardhara*. The stanza RV, VII, 33, 2<sup>d</sup>, occurs in the right the stanza RV, VI, 46, 1<sup>a</sup>, in the left wing. The Śatapatha Brāhmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3 seems to agree with Śākhayana, though not precisely. Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 115, n. Eggeling's explanation of the *ardhara* in the Śatapatha as referring to RV, X, 120, 3<sup>d</sup>, and VIII, 30 1<sup>a</sup>, seems to overlook the fact that in the Śākhayana the *ardhara*, X, 120, 3<sup>d</sup>, carries with it the *ardhara* VIII, 69 1<sup>a</sup>, making up in all *ardhara*, they are called *tau* in Āraṇyaka, II 1.

<sup>3</sup> This is practically a defining genitive. Cf. IV *mayah satvīyam*, and contrast Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 295. Speyer *Deutsche und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 62. Delbrück (*Alindische Syntax*, pp. 123-124) gives examples of the genitive of material and origin, and see *Terzi Sint*, I, 340, 346 sq. The construction *sam paksayoh patindja* is curious. The *sam* is joined with *patanaya* by Sāyana and we might compare for this inflex, *upa-āpīte*, V, 3, 3, or *sam* might be taken with *dhatte* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 2031). The use of the genitive<sup>4</sup> with *patanaya* (as with *apītas*, Śākhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 5, 6, &c.) dissuades it to be regarded as a real infinitive. Cf. Speyer, *Deutsche und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 43, Whitney, *loc. cit.*, §§ 237, 282. The easy conjecture *sam*, though rather tempting, is unnecessary. The conjunction of cow and horse is truly Vedic, cf. Indra's hymn, RV, X, 119 1 *itā vā sis me māno gām dītam sanuīyam sis*, Atharvaveda, XII, 1, 5 *gauram arāṇam*, &c., Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 57, Bloomfield, *False Concordance*, p. 346. For *dītan dhatte*, cf. Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XIV, 28, 9, XV, 6, 7.

<sup>4</sup> It is possible to think of *paksayoh* as a dative (cf. Speyer, *Deutsche und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 12, for the confusion of *śākyān* and *ek* forms), but this is not essential.

a horse, and the wings are made strong to fly. He intertwines these hymns with the verse *nadam va oḍaṇam* (RV, VIII, 69, 2) joining quarter verse with quarter-verse, making them into *brhātī* verses, so that the quarter-verses of the *nada* hymn are second. He also inserts in the first stanza the syllables of the word *purusa*, one in each quarter-verse, at the end, save in the case of the third quarter-verse. Thus does he intertwine them. We will also set (a verse forth) as an example, thus:—

*śad id asa dhūmanem jyeṣṭham pu*  
*nadam va oḍaṇam |*  
*śalo jajña ugras tisanrmo ru*  
*nadam jayavalino 3m ||*  
*śaḥo jajñano ne rinati śatrūn*  
*patim vo aghnyanam |*  
*anu 3am visre madanīy ūmah so*  
*dhenunam vudhyaso 3m ||*

The verse should be thrice repeated\*. Should (the Udgātṛs) sing as the Rājāna Sāman other verses which occur (in the hymns enumerated), then (the Hotṛ) recites them in their own\* place, but here (at the beginning of the Śāstra) he recites these verses (i.e. RV, X, 120, 1-3). If the other verses do not occur in these hymns, he should take as many out of the hymns mentioned and recite the (other verses) in their place, but still recite these verses (RV, X, 120, 1-3) here. (The verses removed) in this case are to be those before the *śudāśas* verse. The Śāstra always begins with the verses commencing, 'That was the

\* The *plvis* and the *em* after the fourth *padā* are probably meant. Cf. Śaṅkhāyana, II cc, and I, § 1. Rajendralala and the Ānandaśrama edition are both inconsistent. For the *plvis*, see Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 297-300. Both *vudhyaso 3m* and *jyeṣṭham 3m* present curious forms, which may be compared with the rule recognized in Pāṇini, VI, 1, 92, that *em* with a preceding *a* vowel gives *em* and this Sandhi in its turn has easy parallels (Macdonell, *1st ed. Grammar*, p. 64). So in Manava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 4, 4 *vanam* stands, in my opinion, for *vanam+em* (cf. II, 7, 1). See also Caland and Heary, *L'Agnihotra*, pp. 212, 166, 278, 232, 237, 238, &c. for examples of this Sandhi.

\* To make up twenty five verses, I 3, 4, 5, 6, Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II 1 *evam vāśīdām prathamaṃ śrīḥ śamsatī pārśvāḥ uttarāḥ*.

\* Literally, 'in their place'. The Udgātṛs may either adopt *śad id asa* at the beginning or *śatṛya* or use other verses in the enumerated hymns, or use quite new verses, but in all cases the Hotṛ must stick to *śad id asa* as a commencement, and must not follow the strophe of the Rājāna Sāman. The new verses are to be inserted before the *śudāśas* verse, omitting a corresponding number of those in the ordinary version. If the verses occur in the hymns enumerated, then they are simply recited in their own original place, since the whole of the first three hymns is included in the Śāstra, and the three verses, I, 31, 4-6, count presumably as a hymn for this purpose. Cf. 3 on V, 2, 2. For the construction, cf. Aitareya Brahmana, V, 7, 1. *mahīmanisv utra stutale śikṛavāna sāmā*.

oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1) The reply of the Adhvaryu is not altered.<sup>7</sup> (Then comes) the *śūdadohas* verse, beginning, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV., VIII, 69, 3)<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> The form used in the *grakṛts* is not altered as it is in the *śoḍaśin* rite (*Sāyana*) On the *pratigara*, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 36, n 3, Eggeling, *S B F.*, XXI, 1, 316, Sabbathier, *Agnistoma*, pp 55, 56, Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literatur*, p. 104, n 45

<sup>8</sup> The verses laid down in Śākhāyana are, after a *tūsmantama* of three verses, RV, X, 120, 1-3. 4-9. X, 29, 1-8, X, 55, 6-8. X, 54, 6; X, 54, 2. X, 56, 1, making 23, the first being twice repeated, and the whole interspersed with the *pādas* of the *nada* hymn. In X, 120, 3, however, the third and fourth *pāda* together with the corresponding *pādas* of the *nada* hymn are omitted, and placed before the *devapādis* (II, 11).

After the body verses the order in Śākhāyana and the Aitareya differs as shown below —

	Sutra,	Āranyaka,
	Śākhāyana, XVI, 1, 2	II, 2
Head verses		
Neck verses (with <i>śāṇḍha</i> , cervical column, <i>J R A S.</i> , 1907, pp 2, 3)	" " 3	" 3
Right side ( <i>akṣa</i> , <i>bahu</i> , <i>grahastaka</i> )	" " 4	" 4, 5
Left side (ditto) <sup>a</sup>	" " 5	" 4, 5
Back ( <i>anukṣa</i> , backbone, perhaps lumbar por- tion in special, <i>J R A S.</i> , 1907, pp 7, 8)	" " 6	" 6
<i>Aśtis</i>	" " 7-13	" 7-10
<i>Vāta</i> hymn	" " 14	" 11
<i>Devapādis</i> (with <i>ardharāva</i> )	" " 15	" 12
<i>Anulagna</i> hymn	" " 16	" 13
<i>Asvapana</i>	" " 17	" 14
<i>Anurukha samamānaya</i>	" " 18	" 15
<i>Tristupakṣa</i>	" " 19, 20	" 16
Neck verses	Aitareya, V, 2, 1	I, 4, 1
Head verses	" "	"
Vertebrae-verses	" "	"
Right wing	" V, 2, 2	I, 4, 2
Left wing	" "	"
<i>Devapādis</i>	" "	"
<i>Aśtis</i>	" V, 2, 3-5	I, 4, 3
<i>Vāta</i> hymn	" V, 2, 5	I, 5, 1
<i>Orū</i> , &c.	" V, 3, 1, 2	I, 5, 1, 2

<sup>a</sup> It should be noted, however, that this division, which is that adopted by Dr Friedlander as doubtful as regards the two sides which (Intro, p. 10) he divides into shoulder, arm, and hand. For the word *śāṇḍha* (really 'cervical column', Hoernle *J R A S.*, 1906, p. 915) occurs in the section dealing with the *grāva* verses, and the word *akṣa* (*yc*) or *akṣa*, both of which are used in Āranyaka II, 3, as regards the part rendered as 'shoulder', seems rather to denote 'collar bone'. At least, so I infer from the fact that *akṣa* has this sense in Caraka and Saṁhita (Hoernle, *J R A S.*, 1907, p. 13), and *akṣa* this sense in the Śatapatha Brahmana. Possibly the reading should be *akṣam* in Āranyaka, *I c* of *akṣa śhōmāśa* (sic) just after, and cf 1, 2, 2, n 11, but *akṣa* is good sense. The exact divisions are probably (a) collar bone, (b) arm, (c) hand.

## ADHYĀYA 2

(Then come) the neck verses 'Of Indra,<sup>1</sup> the smiter, the powerful, the earnest, who has the world, are might and strength, great and delightful The mighty<sup>2</sup> overcomes

<sup>1</sup> These verses occur with many variants in the Atharvaveda, VI, 33 and also in the Paippalada recension, the Naigeya text of the Samaveda, I, 588 which has *arjya yujas tujē jana z inam riddh* and has not the second two verses, and Śaṅkayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 2, where they run *yajedam oja arjyas tujō yujō balam sahaḥ | Indraya ranyam brhat || ana lāstam vipanyaya nādhrīa adadhrtaya | dhṛīnam dhṛītam lātaḥ || as no dadātu taji rajim puru pīlangasamdrīaḥ | Indrah pātu tanastam jameḥ ||* It should, however, be noted that *balam* is merely a conjecture of Hillebrandt's for *vanam* of all his MSS. It is a probable one. The AV version is unintelligible, see Whitney's *Translation* p. 305. In the version given, which is purely conjectural, I have taken *arjyah* as a genitive from Śaṅkayana (the change of *u* and *a* is easy, the accent is dubious), like *tujō* and *yujō*, presumably also genitives. Sayana as usual gives no help, he takes *arjyah* as either (1) *nishcheśyam sarvato rāṣṭrakam*, or (2) *yagatpala nam sarvato rāṣṭrakam*. *Tujō tujō* is *yogo tairinam hamsakā*. *Vanam* is *bhaktair zana myam*. The AV has *ā rjya yujas tujē jana z inam riddh* and *nādhrīa ā dadhrīate dhṛīnādh dhṛītā lātaḥ | purā yāthā vyāthā lāta Indraya nādhrīa lātaḥ*. The Paippalada differs greatly.

<sup>2</sup> The translation again is purely conjectural. Whitney, by reading *adhṛ* + (infin), *dhṛīnām dhṛīdām*, and *vyāthā*, makes it, '(He is) not to be dared against, (his) might, dared, dares daring against (others), as, of old, his fame (was) unwavering, Indra's might (is) not to be dared against.' Taking the Aitareya text as it stands, I think we must resolve *nādhrīa* as *nā dhṛīra* (b) and take the word as an adjective meaning 'impetuous'. I think *nādhrīa* however, almost certainly right (cf. RV, V, 8, 5), 'He is not to be dared against'. The editions and Whitney with Sayana read the two words following as *ā dadhrīate dadhrīdām*. This is quite possible, though the change in quantity is remarkable, but it seems to have escaped notice that *ā dadhrīate dadhrīdām* is quite possible and could have the same sense while keeping the prefix *a* in both cases and restoring the metre (*ā dadhrīate ā dhṛīnām*) and explaining the Śaṅkayana text. If *nādhrīa* is read I would not take the participle as a neuter nom., but translate, 'He dares against the daring his might is dread'. This avoids the inconvenience of the idea of might daring, and the rare use of the present participle as a finite verb. The second half of the line is very obscure. *Ati vyāthā* occurs also in RV, X, 86, 2 and here as there Sayana explains it as a verbal form which is quite impossible, 'When Indra caused his foe to fall'. It might however mean, 'Who trembling (cf. Naigh, II, 23) passed from Indra, referring to the terrors which so often fell on Indra before he showed his might. For a different theory as in *vyāthā* (= track), see RV, IV, 4, 3 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI 351), AV, IV, 21, 3 with Whitney's note, and see Geldner, *Indische Studien*, II 39. Geldner holds that *vyāthā* originally means 'Falschheit' and thence 'Malice, Zorn Ungnade, Ärger, Hass, Feindschaft', and so has the gen. of the subject or object. So he renders RV IV, 4, 3 as, 'no one approaches thee when angry,' and in AV, VI 33 2 takes *purā yāthā vyāthā* (this is the AV accentuation as in AV, IV, 21, 3) *Indra Indraya nādhrīe lātaḥ*, as 'Like a citadel (cf. *aryā* and *dy*, Fickel *Indische Studien*, I, 185) unapproachable, as the anger, the fame, the

not him who is exceeding strong His vigour is dreadful When aforetime trembling passed from him, Indra's might was dreadful May he give us that wealth, wealth of tawny hue Indra is the lord, the most mighty among men' (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse. The head verses are in *gayatrī* metre, beginning, 'The singers call aloud to Indra' (RV, I, 7, 1) If (the Udgātr̥s) sing the Sāman with other verses which occur (in the service), then the two sets are to be interchanged in place.<sup>3</sup> If the other verses are ones not occurring, or some occur and some not, (then they should be inserted in the place of verses occurring which should be taken out) The last verse of the hymn (should be recited, the insertion being made before it) and then the *sūdadohas* verse. Then come

strength of Indra' Unhappily he does not cite or discuss this passage, where of course *puṣṭ* cannot be made by any effort of the imagination to be a noun. But accepting the sense 'wrath', then AV, VI, 33, 2 would give the sense 'As aforetime, the anger', &c., and this passage might be rendered, 'As of old (*parā ydē*) his anger is excessive' (*atī*), and on the whole this is perhaps the least unlikely version of a very difficult and probably corrupt text. Cf. v Schroeder, *Mysterium und Alimus*, p 316, n 2, whose version of RV, X, 86, 2, suggests 'because of anger

For the form of the verse, cf e.g. Vajasaneyi Samhitā I, 8 *dāṛ eṣa dhūrta dhurvantam* | *dāṛva tam ja man durāts tam dhūrta yam dhurva mah*, and Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Lit*, I, 129. In the next verse the AV reads *idm* (Ppp *nd*) *urum* and *turitamāṣ* (APr., III, 96 IV, 29) while the Ppp the comm., and one MS have *dadhatu*, and the commentary on the AV and two MSS (out of three) in Śaṅkṛāyana have '*idṛṣam*'. One MS of Śaṅkṛāyana has *purum* the others *puram*. *Tanditam* occurs in RV, I, 190, 5, II, 33, 3. For the dat inf in *id* cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970.

<sup>3</sup> This is Sayana's version. The Anandāśrama reads *ubhayaśamsthā na viparyaya* with the opposite meaning but this is less probable. The apodosis to the last clause is borrowed from the indication in V, 1, 6. As the next clause shows, the insertion of the new verses is to be made before the last verse preceding the *sūdadohas* verse and not directly before that verse. The word *samamnatāṣu* refers here to verses occurring in the hymn itself. The form *ubhayaśamsthānaḥ viparyayaḥ* however presents great difficulty for the use of *ubhayaś* in compounds is confined to cases like *śakra*, *śrī*, *śasta* &c. and it is hardly likely that the second member of the compound is *śamsthāna* or that the fem is kept because *śc* is fem (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II 1, 49 51). But, further, there is no special meaning in *śamsthāna* and the conjecture *ubhayaśamsthānaviparyayaḥ* is possible. *Ubhayaśam* (team) is precisely correct for two sets of three verses (cf RV, I, 26, 9, 189, 7, and regularly later, cf Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 272), and Sayana's version in no way confirms either the reading of Rājendralāla or the Anandāśrama. The form would be very rare, the ordinary feminine being *ubhayaś* (common in the Aitareya Brahmana) and possibly *ubhayaś* is the Vedic adverb. It may be noted that R's version of the comm., *śam arthā* (R<sup>4</sup> against R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup>) alone makes sense. *śa śam madhye* being nonsense. Cf. introd, p 9.

The Śaṅkṛāyana Śruti Sūtra, XVIII, 2, gives the head verses thus, RV, I, 7, 1-3 I, 6, 7-9, I, 84 13-15, VIII, 76, 10 12, VIII, 93, 1-3, any of those used by the Sāman singers. Some use I, 50, 1-9, to correspond with the Sāman singers. If the latter use only I, 50, 1-3, then the reciter can take any two of the other *śraṣṭ* to make up the nine verses. As in the Aitareya, the recitation is by half verses, and the *sūdadohas* verse occurs at the end.

the vertebrae verses: 'The Soma is pressed for thee, come to the sacrifice, rejoice in the carouse, rich in gifts, for wealth O Indra, thou art generous and young for us to sing' He can overcome his foes in slaying Vritas, he is skilful and a plunger We magnify our leader, Indra Impetuous, bright, the leader, the dweller on the mountains, hastening towards you, Indra, shouting aloud, with his eternal steeds' (Then comes) the *sādanohas* verse The three sets of verses neck, head, and vertebrae, are all to be repeated with a pause at the half-verse<sup>7</sup>

2 The (verses of the) night wing are connected with the Rathantara Saman The Rathantara has for its strophe, 'We praise thee, O hero' (RV, VII, 32, 22), and for its antistrophe, 'Thee for the first drink' (RV., VIII, 3, 7), both being

<sup>6</sup> These verses contain an unusual number of rare expressions, and the uncertainty as to their accent adds to the difficulty The reading of *vijrah* is very doubtful R in the commentary, which is followed by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, S, and the MSS have *vijarah*, while Sayana perhaps read *vidrah* (śaistalakahānārāṇāṃ grādhīya āsmadagre kaḥayitum atra āraṣe Mata) I have translated the *vijrah* (vijrah) of R's text, and taken *grādhīya* as an infinitive practically equivalent to an imperative, 'Let us sing of,' cf Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 411 sq.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 981 d, Hopkins, *A J P*, XIII, 21 sq.; Speyer, *Deutsche und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 116

<sup>7</sup> *Vijrah*, Sayana renders as *scutum laṅkā* Cf RV, III, 3, 5, where it is an epithet of Agni The *id me nistānam* looks like an imitation of older verses, such as RV, II, 6, 5, without much regard to their construction Possibly the reading should be (cf on IV) *idm* (which would become *san* before *no*) So Maṣṭrayant Saṃhita IV, 12, 6, has *sa dānūḥ kṛaṇu dhruvā idmam*, but in Taittiriya Saṃhita, III, 3, 11 *idm*, &c *idm* may be from the root *id* (cf Blau Müller's conjecture on RV, IV, 2, 4, *S B E* XLVI, 330) and meaning 'swift' S takes *racahatur* as one word, but this makes nonsense of Sayana The form is unusual, see Whitney, *Grammar*, § 1161 d

<sup>8</sup> *Sāmajik* (for the form, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 73, 74) apparently means the 'bringer together' *Rjīd* cannot have the sense which it normally has (see Hillebrandt, *I ad Rjīd*, I, 133 sq.; Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, 39) and which is here ascribed to it by Sayana, *vijrahālakāhānārāṇāṃ* In RV, III, 32, 1, it seems to mean impetuous, and cf *rjīd*, *ibid*, I, 32, 6 I am here explains as the husband and wife engaged in the sacrifice, Rājendralala reads *idm* which is quite wrong though followed in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 205 It would of course be acc with *idmajah* *Sāmadhīr* *caruḥ* possibly merely means 'as usual', or 'in his eternal courses' Cf *idm*, 'in due way,' RV, I, 68, 4, 95, 6, *arjīd* *caruḥ*, IV, 2, 11, *S B E*, XLVI 437 These verses are unparalleled in other texts

<sup>9</sup> This means, as Sayana and Śākhāyana show, that there is a pause at the end of the half-verse (and *am* at the end of the verse) The other possibilities are (1) pause at each *pāda*, with *am* at half-verse (2) no pause, *am* at end. The Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra contains examples of all kinds, see I, 234

<sup>10</sup> Cf I, 4, 2

<sup>11</sup> If so it might be taken as two words and translate it 'the giver is to be praised' Cf *idm* *grādhīya* in RV, VI, 34, 5, and cf Śākhāyana Aranyaka, XII, 10



*pragātha* verses. These four *brhatis* he turns into six\* (Then come the hymns), 'I shall proclaim the deeds of Indra' (RV, I, 32), 'In thee since our father, Indra' (RV, VII, 18) fifteen verses only, 'Who is sharp horned, terrible like a bull' (RV, VII, 19), 'Dread is he born for strength, the mighty' (RV, VII, 20), 'Ye have uttered glorious prayers' (RV, VII, 23), 'For greatness, O dread Indra with thine aid' (RV, VII, 25) five hymns, 'From far or near may Indra be with us' (RV, IV, 20) is the *sampata* hymn. 'Thus in the Soma, in the carouse' (RV, I, 80, 1) is a *pankti* verse. (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse. (The verses of the) left wing are connected with the Brihat Saman. The Brihat has for its strophe, 'For thee we hail' (RV, VI, 46, 1) and for its antistrophe, 'Come hither to the worship' (RV, VIII, 61, 7), both being *pragātha* verses. These four *brhatis* he turns into six. (Then come the hymns) 'Praise him who surpasses in strength' (RV, VI, 18), 'Thou art attached to the pressed Soma, Indra' (RV, VI, 23) three hymns, 'Thou art the only lord of riches, O lord of riches' (RV, VI, 31) eight hymns, 'What whose sacrifice has he increased?' (RV, IV, 23) is the *sampata* hymn. 'Indra is born for the carouse' (RV, I, 81, 1) is a *pankti* verse. (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse. The right wing is connected with the Rathantara Saman, and so is the *pañcadāśa stoma*†. There are one hundred and one (verses) in it, and it is called the Vasisthaprāśāha. The left wing is connected with the Brihat Saman and so is the *asṭadāśa stoma*. There are one hundred and two verses, and it is called the Bharadījaprasāha. The (verses of the) tail, as being *tripadas* are connected with the Bhadrā Saman. There are nine verses from the Samhitā. 'These worlds let us conquer' (RV, X, 137) and 'Come hither with thy splendour' (RV, X, 172) and there are also other verses not from the Samhitā‡ (These are), 'Ye priests, sing forth a song to Indra who beyond all others slays the foe, that he may rejoice'§

\* The two *pragāthas* give only four *brhatis*. The six are made up by repeating twice the fourth *pāda* of I V, VII 32, 21, and reading with it the first half of I V, VII, 31, 21. Then the fourth *pāda* of this second *brhati* is twice repeated and with the second half of I V, VII 31, 21 makes the third *brhati*. By I, 1, 6, for the *pāda*, I V, VII, 32, 21, is to be substituted I V, I, 130, 3.

† The Rathantara Saman is the basis of the *pañcadāśa stoma* or hymn form. The term *śaśi* (*śaśi* *prāśāha*) is clearly the technical name of what is called elsewhere (see *St. Petersburg Diet*) *śaśi* *prāśāha*. Similarly in the case of the *asṭadāśa stoma* and cf II 2 2, n 11 for the attributions. The syntax of I V, VI 31, 1, is curious: see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 106, I *erg* *Synt* I 39, and cf in Latin *Ecce* III 29 *censorem trabente solutus*. For *prāśāha*, cf *Z D M G* XLV III 548.

‡ These are given also in Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XI III 15 where they follow *ena* *brāhma* &c. Some are also in the Samaveda. The two I V hymns have five and four verses.

§ Śākhāyana has *yajate*. See Samaveda I 446 II, 463 where are *tyajate* and *yajam yajate*. For the form, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammars*, § 810. In VII of Samaveda has *yajate*.



'To the yokes for him' (RV VII, 34.4),<sup>15</sup> the *sūdadhāra* verse, the *dhājyā* verse, 'What he won' (RV, X, 74.6), and the *sūdadhāra* verse

*ś stobhata* and *grā stobhā* must be active, and so here and in RV, I, 79, 12, the activity may be that of the god not of the poet. In the RV passage it has just been said *agnir rākramsi stobhata*, and I see no reason to give a passive sense to *grānte*. The verses may then be rendered, 'The holy season's lord, Indra by name, famous, utters praise. Let gifts approach thee, Indra, as paths the way. Like songs, to thee, lord of might do men fare eagerly.' It should be noted that in I, 438, the Samaveda has *grānt*, but in II 1216 *grānt*. The accent on *grānt* is quite unintelligible,<sup>16</sup> and can only be explained by the fact that the Taittiriya Brahmana,<sup>17</sup> II 10, has *gand*. In the Aitareya only *asa brahma* (not as Aufrecht's text *asā*) is cited, a striking instance of the danger of arguments from the use of *prastāva* only as a sign of later redaction (cf. Bloomfield's proof of the posteriority of the Gopālha Brahmana to the Vaitāna Sūtra, Jnirōd, p. 26), since the argument would show that the Aitareya Brahmana was later than the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, cf. also Oldenberg's remarks in *Gott. gel. Anz.*, 1907, p. 234, n. 1.

<sup>15</sup> Śaṅkhāyana adds the verses, RV, VIII, 29.4, and VI, 17, 15, but as there are only six instead of nine new verses the total number of *dhājyā* verses made up is still only twenty one. The Aitareya adds a twenty second verse see I, 4, 2.

The passages corresponding to the *patas* are given in Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 4. 5, thus the sides are divided into the *akṣar*, *bakṣar* (arms), and *prākṣatāka* (hand). The *akṣar* are VI, 47, 8, and a verse not from the RV, *sa turye samayam, āc*. Then for the right *bakṣar*, the strophe of the *rakṣantara samam* repeated as a *kāśhā*, then the *sūdadhāra* verse. Then similarly the antistrophe and a *dhājyā* verse. Then the *rakṣantara prāgṛāha*. Then the hymn, RV, VI, 22, exchanging for VI, 22, 2, the verse X, 28, 2. For the left *bakṣar* precisely the same treatment of the *brāhṣa samam*, but no *dhājyā*, and the hymn X, 28, with VI, 22, 2, as its second verse. The *prākṣatāka* are respectively VIII, 97, 13-15 and VIII, 97, 10-12.

Then comes XVIII, 6, the *catvārttārāṇa*, viz. RV, VIII, 92. 19-22, VIII, 12, 22-24, I, 20, 1-3, VIII, 11, 3, 4 (a *prāgṛāha*, or 3. 5), by half verses, I, 80, 1-3 (*pañcīsamānta*), VI, 34. 1-3, and I, 83. 4. 6 *pañchar*, then the *sūdadhāra*.

It is worthy of note that, just as the Aitareya refers only to the *asa brahma* verses by the *prastāva* of the first verse, so the Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 15. 4 also uses only the *prastāva*. It is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that this book XVIII (and presumably, also XVII) must be not earlier nor later than the main body of the Sūtra and this will modify in some extent Hillebrandt's view, *Ritual Liturgien*, p. 25. Similarly the Āraṇyaka may be written after the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra. Cf. my note in *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 410-412.

In the Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 18, 1, it is said that Vāmadeva was the seer of RV, IV, 19, 21 and 23 and that Vāmadeva *avayata* them, *ten kṛpam samapadai*, while in IV, 30, 2, RV, IV, 20 and 21, are also declared to be *avayata* hymns. Vāmadeva *va imāhi śikṣa apayata ten samapadai samapadai* (See, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rigveda*, p. 103).

<sup>16</sup> It falls under none of the exceptional cases, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 106. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 597, 598, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 70 sq., Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 21-29, Oldenberg, *Z D M G.*, LX, 707-740, see my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 202.

<sup>17</sup> Also the Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 13, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 207.

3. (Then come) the eighty *gājatrī* tristuchs<sup>1</sup> He takes out the last three verses of the hymn, 'Great is Indra who by his might' (RV, VIII, 6). (Then come) three verses of the hymn, 'A cake for us' (RV., VIII, 78). Of the verses following, 'Indra indeed is the drinker of Soma beyond others' (RV., VIII, 2, 4), he omits the last three. Of the others he omits, 'Sweet are the draughts of Soma, come hither' (ibid, 28), and puts in its place the verse, 'No other mighty one' (RV, VIII, 80, 1). (Then comes) one verse, 'Born with a hundred strengths' (RV, VIII, 77, 1). (Then comes) the remainder (of the hymn, RV, VIII, 92), 'Much invoked, much praised' (ibid, 2). He omits the last verse of the hymn, 'To him that hath renowned treasures' (RV, VIII, 93 1). (Then come the hymns), 'The deeds of the impetuous one' (RV, VIII, 32), 'Those that kindle Agni' (RV, VIII, 45) and 'For us, O Indra, rich in food' (RV, VIII, 81), and the following hymn. (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse

4 (Then come) the eighty *brhāṣī* tristuchs<sup>1</sup> There are twenty nine verses

<sup>1</sup> They are—

RV, VIII, 6, 1-45	=	45 verses
" 78, 1-3	=	3 "
" 2 4-39	=	36 "
(For verse 28, RV, VIII, 80, 1, is substituted)		
" 77, 1	=	1 "
" 92, 2 33	=	31 "
" 93 1-33	=	33 "
" 32	=	30 "
" 45	=	42 "
" 81	=	9 "
" 82	=	9 "
<hr/>		
= 240 verses.		

In Śaṅkhuṣaṇḍa Śrauta Sutra, \VIII, 7, the verses are RV, VIII 6, 1-45, 2, 4 27, 31-39, 45 1-42, 32, 1-30, 92 4 18, 22-33, 93 4 18, 22-33, III, 51, 10-12, \VIII, 76, 10-12, 69, 4-6, \I, 45, 1-30, which gives 81 *verses* and not 80. The number is reduced to 80 by the omission of one of the three *verses* III, 51, 10-12, VIII, 76, 10-12, 69 4-6.

<sup>1</sup> These are—

RV, \VIII, 1, 1-29	=	29 verses.
" 3 1-6, 9 20	=	18 "
" 4 1-14	=	14 "
" 33, 1-15	=	15 "
VII, 32, 1, 2, 4-21, 24 7	=	24 "
(For VII, 31 10, is substituted \III, 99, 1)		
6 Vāṅkṣā hymns	=	56 "
\I, 46, 3-14	=	12 "
III, 44	=	5 "
III 45	=	5 "

of the hymn, 'Sing of nought else' (RV, VIII, 1) He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the twenty stanzas beginning, 'Drink the fragrant Soma' (RV, VIII, 3, 1) (Then come) fourteen stanzas beginning, 'When, Indra, forward, backward, upward' (RV, VIII, 4, 1) Then fifteen stanzas beginning, 'We with the Soma thee' (RV, VIII, 33, 1) In the hymn, 'May not thee the sacrificers' (RV, VII, 32), he omits the *dupadā* (ibid, 3), and the *pragātha* connected with the Rathantara Sāman (ibid, 22) Further he omits the *pragātha*, 'No one Sudās' chariot' (ibid, 10), and inserts in its place the *pragātha*, 'Thee men but yesterday' (RV, VIII, 99, 1) (Then) six Vālakhilya hymns beginning, 'Him of good gifts' (RV, VIII, 49, 1) (Then) the rest (of the hymn, RV, VI, 45), beginning, 'Who active ever slays the foe' (ibid, 3) (Then) two hymns beginning, 'May this delightful one for thee' (RV, III, 44, 1) He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the hymn, 'Both let him hear' (RV, VIII, 61) He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'With strength him that finds treasure' (RV, VIII, 66) (Then come) eleven stanzas beginning, 'Who is king of men' (RV, VIII, 70, 1) (Then the hymns), 'Him who works wonders, enduring the onslaught' (RV, VIII, 88), 'To be invoked by us in all' (RV, VIII, 90), and nine verses of the hymn, 'The blessings thou dost bear, Indra' (RV, VIII, 97). (Then comes) the *sūdadaha* verse.

RV, VIII, 61, 1-6, 9-18	= 16 verses
„ 66, 1-14	= 14 „
„ 70, 1-11	= 11 „
„ 88	= 6 „
„ 90	= 6 „
„ 97, 1-9	= 9 „
	<hr/>
	= 140 verses

Of these however, no less than 80 are *satabhakti* verses. In Śāṅkhyaṇa Śranta Sūtra, XVIII, B 11, the *śloka* is given as follows. VIII, 97, 1-9, VIII, 61, 7-9, 1, 36, 7, 8, VIII, 70, 7-12, = 20 *pratyakṣabhaktis* then VI, 46, 3-10, VII, 32, 1, 2, 4-9, VII, 31, 12-21, VII, 32, 24-37, VIII, 1, 1-4, *ma n tva parucaso*, VIII, 3, 9-12, VIII, 3, 17-20, VIII, 4, 1-14, VIII, 61, 3-6, VIII, 61, 9-18, VIII, 66, 3-14. Hillebrandt in his index gives the references differently, but this is apparently due to a confusion between *pragāthas* and *stanzas*. There are really 43 *pragāthas*. The one *ma n, &c.* is not apparently from the Samhitā, Hillebrandt's indices all ignore it, and it does not appear in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*. Of the last six, three only are selected to make up the 40. Then come 20 more *pratyakṣabhaktis*, VIII, 1, 5-24. Then 20 more. VIII, 1, 25-29, VIII, 33, 1-15. Then 40 *pragāthas*, the three over the first 40, VIII, 70, 1-6, VIII, 88, 1, 2, VIII, 90, 1-6, VIII, 99, 1-8, VIII, 49-55 (the Vālakhilyas), omitting VIII, 53, 5, 6, 54, 3, 4. Then I, 175, 1, VI, 43, 4, III, 53, 18, VI, 47, 19, VIII, 78, 10, VIII, 89, 7, VIII, 101, 13, X, 102, 1, 3, 13, making 20 *abhaktis*, and III, 44, 43, making up 20 in all. The whole *bhakti śloka* consists therefore of 80 *abhaktis* and 80 (not 160 as Friedländer) *pragāthas*, giving (80 + 80 =) 160 *abhaktis* and 80 *satabhaktis*, just as in the Anāreya. Cf Śāṅkhyaṇa Ananyak, II, 8 and 9, for the *gāyatri* and *bhakti śloka*.

5 (Then come) the eighty *urniś* tristichs.<sup>1</sup> There are the two hymns beginning, 'Indra who is the greatest drinker of the Soma' (RV., VIII, 12, 1). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Sing forth to him' (RV., VIII, 15) (Then comes) the hymn, 'To Indra sing the *sāman*' (RV., VIII, 98) He omits the last three stanzas of the hymn, 'Let us utter, O comrades' (RV., VIII,

' There are—	RV, VIII, 12	= 33 stanzas.
	" 13	= 33 "
	" 15, 1-12	= 12 "
	" 98	= 12 "
	" 24, 1-27	= 27 "
	I, 84, 7-9	= 3 "
	V, 40, 1-3	= 3 "
	VI, 43, 1-3	= 3 "
		= 126 <i>urniś</i> stanzas.

Then <i>gayatri</i> stanzas—	RV., VIII, 14	= 15 stanzas.
	" 16	= 15 "
	" 17, 1-15	= 15 "
	III, 37, 1-10	= 10 "
	I, 4	= 10 "
	" 5	= 10 "
	" 6	= 10 "
	" 8	= 10 "
	" 9	= 10 "
	VI, 45, 1-30	= 30 "
	I, 30, 13-15	= 3 "
		= 133 <i>gayatri</i> stanzas, or 114 <i>urniś</i> stanzas
		making in all 240 <i>urniś</i> .

According to Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra the verses are RV, VIII 12 1-33, VIII, 12, 1-21, 25-33, VIII, 15, 1-12, VIII, 24, 1-27, I, 84, 7-9, V, 40, 1-3, = 36 *trcas* or 108 *urniś* stanzas, XVIII, 12. Then, XVIII, 13, come RV, IV, 30, 1-6, IV, 30, 9-22, IV, 31, 1-22, I, 30, 1-15, VIII, 14, 1-15, VIII, 16, 1-12, VIII, 64, 1-22, VIII, 82, 1-9 (Hillebrandt's I, 30, 1-5, and VIII, 82, 1-7 are slips), making 104 *gayatri* stanzas. Then VIII, 21, 1-16, *kakubhāḥ pragāṭhas*, then VIII, 98, 1-22 in *urniś*. We thus get 240 stanzas, consisting of 120 (108+12) *urniś*, 104 *gayatri*, 8 *kakubhāḥ*, and 8 *satsbrāhats* (i.e. VIII, 21, 1-16). The Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 10, points out that to get 240 *urniś* it is necessary to take away four syllables from each of the 8 *satsbrāhats*, which with 160 *brāhats* make up (V, 2, 4) the *brāhats* *trcas*. Then the 8 *kakubhāḥ* give 8 *urniś*, while the 8 *satsbrāhats* yield each three, or 24 in all, sets of four syllables. Adding the 80 and the 24 we have 104 sets of four syllables, which added to the 24 *gayatri* give 104 *urniś*, to which again must be added 120 *urniś*, 8 *kakubhāḥ*, and 8 *urniś*, left after the deduction of 24 syllables from each *satsbrāhāt*, making a grand total of 240 *urniś*.

This complicated version, as Dr Friedlander points out, probably arises from an attempt to remedy the apparent inaccuracy of the Aitareya in permitting 80 *satsbrāhats* in the *brāhats* *trcas*. Its success is not obvious, and that the attempt should be made may fairly be reckoned a sign of lateness.

24, 1) Then three tristichs, 'Who alone bestowed' (RV, I, 84, 7), 'Come hither to what is pressed with stones' (RV, V, 40, 1), and, 'Under whose sway Śambara' (RV, VI, 43, 1) *Gāyatrī* verses become *usnik* verses by equalization. Every seven *gayatrīs* make six *usniks*. (Then come) the hymn beginning, 'If, Indra, I, like thee' (RV, VIII, 14, 1) and the two hymns beginning, 'The lord of men' (RV, VIII, 16, 1). He omits the last two stanzas of the second hymn. He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'For the strength that slays Vṛtra' (RV, III, 37). (Then come) three hymns beginning, 'The doer of fair deeds to our aid' (RV, I, 4, 1). Then two hymns beginning, 'Indra, lasting wealth' (RV, I, 8, 1). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Who has brought from afar' (RV, VI, 45). Then come three stanzas of the hymn beginning, 'Let splendid feasts be ours' (RV, I, 30, 13). (Then comes) the *sūdadahaś* verse. In the case of all these three sets of eighty tristichs, there is made a pause after the half stanza. The eighty tristichs are the food, and the *vaśa* verses are the stomach (of the bard). The *vaśa* hymn begins, 'Worthy of thee, O wealthy one' (RV, VIII, 46, 1), and ends 'Gainer, gainer of good' (ibid, 20). The verse, 'Giving wealth' (ibid, 15) is a *drupada*, and, 'Now then' (ibid) an *ekapada*. It ends with the verse, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV, VIII, 69, 3). (Then comes) the *sūdadahaś* verse.

<sup>1</sup> Cf I, 5, 1. The explanation of the number 21 stanzas given by Sayana there and here is that the passage ends with verse 20 and the *sūdadahaś* verse makes up the 21. This view may be supported by the fact that the *sūdadahaś* verse is here set out with its *prasthā*. It is most probable that we should understand that the 21 stanzas are made up by the inclusion of the *sūdadahaś* verse and then that there follows again that verse in its usual capacity of separating the different parts of the whole. Sayana does not clearly appear thus to have taken it, but it seems most probably so, and the translation is based on this view.

Śaṅkṣayana in Aranyaka, II, 11, and Śrauta Sūtra XVIII, 14, takes the whole hymn, VIII, 46, as being used. The priority of the Altareya is evident as vv 21-24 contain a *dānśruti* of Pṛthāśravaṇa. The same remark applies to the Śatapatha Brahmana, see Eggeling, *S B E*, XLII, 112.

It is worthy of note that an annotator in *S<sup>2</sup>* considers that Śiṅgane's explanation of the number 21 is inconsistent (this is not the case) and inaccurate. He argues that the 21 stanzas are made up by splitting ver 15 into an *ekapadi* and a *drupadi*. This view is at first sight plausible but the mention here of these divisions is more probably due to an explanation of *pañcapadum* in I, 5, 1, and so Sayana there takes it. The other view is, however, accepted by Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 112 n 2, who points out that the version of the Mahadukṛta contained in MS Ind Off 1729 D gives ver 15 as an *ekapada* and a *drupada*, which certainly tells against Sayana.

For *gayatrīs* and *usniks*, cf Rgveda Prātiśākhya, XVI, 200q, for *sampada*, Śiṅkṣayana Śrauta Sūtra, XV, 10, 5.

## ADHYĀYA 3.

(Then come) the thigh (verses)<sup>1</sup> In the hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV, VIII, 40), (he recites) the half-stanzas as *gayātrīs*,<sup>2</sup> but the second half of the second as an *anustubh*, up in the last stanza. The hymn, 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV, X, 50), has *anuds* inserted. Between the two hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been set down' (RV, X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV, II, 12), are<sup>3</sup> inserted the hymn, 'Come hither standing on thy chariot-seat' (RV, III, 43), and the stanza, 'Wandering alone in the midst of many' (RV, X, 55, 5). As many decades<sup>4</sup> of verses in *tristubh* and *jagati* addressed to Indra as they insert, after transforming them into *brhatis*, so many years may a man be fain to live beyond the normal life, at the rate of ten verses for a year<sup>5</sup>; or he need not do so. (Then come) the

<sup>1</sup> Cf I, 5, 1. The verses are RV, VIII, 40, 1-10, X, 50, 1-7, X, 29, 1-18; III, 43, 1-8; X, 55, 5, II, 12, 1-15, V, 178, 1-3, an *āpāda*, I, 11, 1-8; VII, 23, 1-5; VII, 24, 1-4, 6, 8.

In Śāṅkhāyana the *śaśa* hymn is followed, XVIII, 13, by the *āpādas*, I, 2, 2, above; then comes the *Ānandragṇa sukta*, VIII, 40. Then the *āpādas*, RV, X, 167, 1, II, 21, 1-6; I, 84, 10, 12, VII, 31, 10-12, VI, 46, 1-3. Then the *anustubh samamṇaya*, RV, I, 10, 4-12, I, 11, 1-8, I, 84, 1-6, I, 72, 1-5, I, 176, 1-5, V, 35, 1-7, V, 33, 1, 2, V, 39, 1-4; VI, 44, 1-6, VIII, 34, 1-15, VIII, 63, 4, 6, VIII, 89, 5, 6, VIII, 95, V, 132. Then the *tristubhāśa*, RV, I, 32, VI, 25, II, 32, II, 14, III, 41, III, 46, III, 51, 4-6, IV, 16; VII, 24, VII, 23, VIII, 69, 12-15. See Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 16-20, Āranyaka, II, 12-15. These confused masses of verses show distinctly the later character of the Śāṅkhāyana ritual. See also Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, where RV, X, 50, is called the spine, IX, 2, 1, 44, 3, 3, 19. In the last passage the *śaśa* is given as 33 in Eggeeling (*S B E*, XLII, 223), which must be an error as there are only 33 verses cf. introd., p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> The second verse is a *āpāda* in *śaśvare*. The first three feet make up a *gayātri*, that is, they are recited with a pause after the second foot and *om* after the third. The second four feet are recited as an *anustubh*, with a pause after the second and *om* after the fourth. The last is a *tristubh*, and it is recited by *śuḍaśa*, that is, a pause after the first foot and *om* after the second. The remaining ten verses are in *mahāpāṇkti*, and therefore are each divided into two *gayātrīs* for recitation. It is characteristic of the deliberate differences between Aitareya and Śāṅkhāyana that the latter, XVIII, 16, divides ver. 2 into an *anustubh* and a *gayātri*, not *vice versa*.

<sup>3</sup> That is, if one desires life (Sāyana). See n 5. For II, 55, 5, cf. Ludwig, *Agvāta*, III, 186, Hillebrandt, *Fed. Myth*, I, 465.

<sup>4</sup> Cf I, 5, 2, n 6. Sāyana here renders *śaśatī* as verses produced in the Saṃhitā, which is a collection of ten Mandalas. But the *śaśatī* below certainly suggests that it means decades as probably in I, 5, 2.

<sup>5</sup> This must be the meaning, and so Sāyana takes it. He, however, takes *na rā* as meaning that each *brhatis* produces a year of life, contradicting the ten *brhatis* rule. This is not impossible, in which event he points out the insertion of the nine *tristubh* verses gives eleven *brhatis* or eleven years' longer life. But it is not natural, and it ignores *tristubh-jagatinim*, there being no *jagatis* in the nine verses, and therefore in accordance with the ordinary use



hymn, 'That steed impelled by the gods' (RV, X, 178), and the *ekajada*,<sup>6</sup> 'Indra rules all' (Then comes) the *anustubh* hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV, I, 11). Having recited the first half stanza of the first stanza of this hymn, he combines<sup>7</sup> the first half-stanza of the second stanza with the second half-stanza (of the first stanza) (joining) quarter-stanza with quarter-stanza so as to make *anustubhs*. Up to the last stanza he combines every succeeding half stanza with the preceding. The rest are done in the usual way. (There are) six verses beginning, 'Drink, Indra, the Soma, let it gladden thee' (RV, VII, 23, 1). Having recited four verses of the hymn, 'Thy place, O Indra, is made on thy seat' (RV, VII, 24), and then joining<sup>8</sup> the last stanza, he ends with the second last stanza. The Sastra finished,<sup>9</sup> he mutters the *ukthasampad*. In the place of the *uktharirya* the *ukthadoha* is used.

2. 'Thou art the head of the world,' the essence of speech, the fire of breath,

of *na ta* in Āśvalayana (e.g. Śruti Sutra, VI, 5, 22), Śaṅkha's pupil,<sup>10</sup> I take it to mean that, unless one is *ayukthama* one need not insert the verse. Cf. Sayana's note *yady ayukthamah syat tadānu* *praktiser*, whence it appears that he did not regard the *avapana* as essential. He may be combining two differing previous comments. The idea is curiously inverted.

<sup>6</sup> Not in the Rgveda. See Samaveda I 456, *ṣaṣṭasamviti* Samhitā XXXVI B, Āśvalayana Śruti Sutra, VIII, 2, 21, Śāmaśikṣā Brahmana, II, 6, 7, which all have *vīśatya vīśat*.

<sup>7</sup> See I 5, 2, n 12. Śaṅkhyana XVIII 20, applies the same combination to the *ududrakṛm* hymn RV, VII, 23. The first and last half stanzas in both cases are left unaltered. The other sets of four *pa* *sa* are treated as *anustubhs*.

<sup>8</sup> For a formal definition of *paritapa* see Āśvalayana Śruti Sutra, I, 2, 10.

<sup>9</sup> In the Agnistoma the *prakti* the Niskeralya Śastra Eggeling, *J B E*, XXVI, 359 n, ends with a Mantra *uktham sacandriyapātrata* for Āśvalayana Śruti Sutra, V, 13 23 of which *uktham sacandriya* forms the *ukthasampad*, and the rest the *uktharirya*. The Hois here recites the *sampad* but in the place of the *uktharirya* come the *ukthadoha* in the verses set out in V 3 2. For the *uktharirya* of V, 1 3, n 6. Haug, *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 177. Eggeling *l c*, 372, n. Caland and Henry, *L Agnistoma*, p. 233. Sayana ascribes the verses and formulae to a *śakha* *śara* as usual.

<sup>10</sup> The rendering of these verses is very doubtful and I have mainly followed Sayana. The difficulty is increased by the fact that E has here no accents, and Pāṇḍralāla has apparently followed a most corrupt MS or has scattered accents at random. They do not occur in Śaṅkhyana. Both Pāṇḍralāla and the Anandāśrama edition print the verses with stops only at *śrāvaṇa* *syāma* *prapata* and *duḥkṛant* (and in the former case also at *at*), as if they were prose. They seem clearly, however to be intended as verses and I have divided them into *paṇḍ* with mixed *śrāvaṇa*. *śrāvaṇa* may belong to the first verse, and other divisions are no doubt possible but the original metrical form of e.g. *śrāvaṇa* *śrāvaṇa* *śrāvaṇa* is certain. For similar cases of verse treated as prose cf. *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*, I 11, 25, 3 and 27 2 and 3 where *śrāvaṇa* appears in prose form. In VIII, 27, 3 *śrāvaṇa* is two syllables only.

<sup>11</sup> The Brhaddevitā IV, 139, in the 'B' recension mentions Āśvalayana, and though this may point to the verse being late, it may also be quite correct, since a pupil of Śaṅkha appears to have been the author of the Brhaddevitā, cf. Macdonell I xxiv and Uvāṇyana was under the eye of one of his oldest pupils.

the abode of mind, the entrance of the eye, the source of the ear, the resting place of the heart, thou art all. (Thou art) Indra, the undying sacrifice, the ambrosia, the sky, right, truth, conquest, decision, the end of speech, the pervading, that which is beyond all, the light, the odder, the unanswerable, that which was before Thou art all,<sup>1</sup> speech, the water with the lightning that goes thither and returns,<sup>2</sup>

as elsewhere. A striking example of verse disguised as prose is the inscription on the Piprahva stupa, see Fleet, *J R A S.*, 1907, pp 111 sq. following, with minor differences, Thomas, *J R A S.*, 1906, pp 462 sq. In the Aitareya, II *et.* we have —

*Asatrena ksatram jayate balena balam anuṣṭe |*  
*yayartam vidvan brāhmana satragrahaḥ purohitaḥ ||*  
*tasmas tatāḥ samjanāt sammukha śamanomaḥ |*  
*jayantam tatvan brāhmana satragrahaḥ purohitaḥ || 28 || 11 ||*  
*tatya raja mitram bhavati (2 syl) dvantam apobadhate |*  
*jayantam vidvan brāhmana tā tragrahaḥ purohitaḥ |*  
*tasmat vidat, etc., as above,*

and in other places fragments of verse appear, as is only natural since gnomic sayings like them tend in all languages to become verse. The old character of these Ślokaś appears from their metrical form, and they may be compared with the verse cited from Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 8, 4, 3, by Oldenberg (*S B E.*, XXX xix). Similar verses composed at later dates are found in the characteristic late metre in the Gṛhya Sūtras, quite freely (Oldenberg, I c, xxiv-xxvii), one being attributed (Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 7, 16) to Śaunaka and Ślokaś are recognised in the lists of compositions, e.g. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 4, 20; IV, 2, 2, see Saeg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, pp 7 sq.

<sup>1</sup> *Sāyana* has *jayya yayya vidvāno jad jat furvam karamam ruṣam tat sarvam vīṣam*, and he explains *padraś ardeś* as *utamedhamarudā tād*.

<sup>2</sup> *Sāyana* is to be explained by *Sāyana*, and *padraś* and *ardeś* probably go with *satyam*. In the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, I, 9, 10, this passage from *Indraś amritam duhanam* appears, but in a different connexion and in an inferior perhaps secondary, form, which looks as if it were borrowed from the Āranyaka. The parallelism has escaped not only Oertel but also Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*). Quite irrelevantly appear the words (the *griyāṭra* as *brahman* is the subject of discourse) *tasyantam vamanindrah karmākṣetr amritam vjāmāṇo vacat | bahur bhūyas sarvam sarvasmad uttarām jyotāḥ | itam satyam vjāmam anuṣṭam aprat vjāmam | furvam sarvam sarvā tād | sarvam idam api dhenuḥ finste sarv arvaḥ || 9 || tā prthakṛtām kāmāduḥkātāś prthakāmāṇām cakṣurītram rakṣābhūṣaṇi manāḥ vjāptam kṛdyāgram brāhmanābhāṣam anuḥbhūṣam sarvaspantam gubhāgam prthivyufaram śapastam | arnnaparyāṣatanam indrabrahmaṇe sahasrakṣaram agnādīṣam amritam duhana sarvam imant loban akṣīkṛtātāḥ |* Oertel reads, 'These are its names. Indra, action, imperishableness, the immortal, end of the firmament of speech, the manifold, the numerous, the all, the light higher than the all, righteousness, truth distinction decision which is not to be contradicted, the ancient all, all speech. This all also, [like] a cow, fattens hitherward, thitherward. She that milks immortality possessing individual oceans (I), possessing wish granting imperishableness, connected with breath possessing sight and hearing, superior by speech, permeated by the mind, having the heart as its point, apportioned to the Brahmanas, pleasant through food, having the rain as means of purification (I) cow-protecting higher than the earth, having penance as a body, having Varuna as an enclosure, having Indra as leader, possessing a thousand syllables, possessing ten thousand streams, flows in all directions unto all these worlds.' It

which yields milk and fattens\* (Thou art) the eye, the ear, breath, that which is

should be noted that the MSS read *ṛiṣṭhānam*, a clear error for *ṛiṣṭyānam*, properly a perf part. middle of  $\sqrt{\text{ṛiṣ}}$  (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 809), a word elsewhere unknown but of interesting function (for  $\sqrt{\text{ṛiṣ}}$ , cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I 146), which is rendered very probable by the metre, *āprastavagāh* (C), *ā cakre vātram, ārdajagram, brāhmaṇāhāritam* (a), *āharatram* (R), *ākratram* (C), *Varmapariyatānam, dūhanāh*. These readings confirm the *brāhmaṇāhāritam* of the *Āraṇyaka* text. *Ārdajagram* is no doubt a possible and an easy conjecture, but Sayana already had *ārdajagram*, and its appearance here certainly shows that the tradition hardened to *ārdajagram* at a very early date. *Annasūbham* is tempting, but uncertain as Sayana read *annasūbha*. Cf *Śatapatha Brahmana*, IX, 5, 1, 12, *soṣantṛiṣṭam* for *Mantrayānya Samhitā*, III, 7, 3, *soṣantṛiṣṭam*. So in *Atharvaveda* XIV, 1, 11, *īrō's* replaces RV, X, 85, 11, *īrō'tram* quite wrongly (cf Whitney, *Translation*, p 742). I consider therefore that (especially in view of the accent) it is very likely that *annasūbham* should be replaced. For *ārdajagram* if it really is — *ārdajagram* might be compared *Matrāyāni Upaniṣad*, VI, 25, *duḥśarmadhām* for *āndham* (Blax Müller, *S B E*, XV, 1). But error of text is easy. *Vyvanānto vacāh* must, I think, be divided into *vjāna* and *antō vacāh*. The sense ascribed to *Indraśreṣṭham* is possible, an *I* in *frejyestham* may mean (as in RV, AV, and TS) 'having India as its base'. *Varmapariyatānam* may perhaps be right, but it is far from certain, and Sayana had *varunatayastanam*, a more reconducte form (see n 13 on II, 4 3) than that in the *Brahmana*. The words *bahur dānyas* should be *bāhur dānyāh*. This example answers the query of Speyer, *Pedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 122, n 2, as to whether the idiom 'sunder als suus' is Vedic as well as classic (his *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 351 3). The same phrase is found in V, 1, 8 in a *Mantra* passage, and in the parallel passage, *Saṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka* I, 8. Cf also such phrases as *bāhu ca me dānyas ca me*, *Taittiriya Samhitā* IV, 7 4, 2, *J R A S*, 1909.

The accents of the R edition are very incorrect. *Pseudocum* is quite impossible. In the case of the compounds R has *ārdajagras, brāhmaṇāhāritām vārtapasttram vārtprāhātim, pṛiṣṭyānam, īśāśānu, Indrajyēṣṭham ayuktsāram, brāhmaṇāśāram, Varsāpativam* is supported by *varsānarmy* (RV), and *varsāmedas* (AV, \**medhas*, AV Paup); *sādhāradhāritam* by the RV, *ayuktsāram* by analogy with *sādhāradhāram*, &c., *īśāśānu* and *brāhmaṇāhāritam* depend on analogy. *Indrajyēṣṭham* has abundant authority. *gāhaganam* may be compared with *gāmagāh* (hV), but cf *grāhāy* (RV). *Pāṭprāhādam* and *satyāsammitam* are supported by usage (Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* p 96. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 4, 227 sq.), and *ārdajagram* is probable (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1287 a, gives several examples of different accents, Wackernagel, pp 238 sq., decides for accent on the first member as usual in determinatives with adjectives at the end (for examples, cf p 233). On this analogy, *Arthavyajaram* may be right or possibly we should read *pṛiṣṭyā uparam* as two words, but the gender of *uparam* would be strange if it is a noun (mean ng either 'lower Soma stone' (RV, AV, but cf *i id Stud* I, 108 sq.), or 'lower part of sacrificial post' (VS)), since there it is always masculine (cf n 5). The accent on *ś druma* must remain doubtful, but if it is a case of a post part, the accent should be on the first. None of these words have found their way into Wackernagel's lists.

For similar cases of double accent in MSS, cf Schefelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rigveda*, pp 59, 49 (from B). Wackernagel, p 40, points out that in cases of compounds the *Atharvaveda*, XI and XX, *Śatapatha Brahmana*, *Taittiriya Āraṇyaka* and *Matrāyāni Upaniṣad* (he ignores this work) are very badly accented. His theory of accent (pp 40 sq.) lays stress on the fact that determinatives (save those with verbal second parts—other than forms in *tu, ti*) originally had the accent on the first part and only later on the second. The accents here must depend on some extent on (a) the validity of the theory, (b) the view as to the age of the *Āraṇyaka*.

\* *Arerats* as it stands spoils the construction, but may be right. Possibly it was originally

measured by truth, which is produced by speech, and proceeds from the mind, what is truth in the heart, and borne by Brahmins (Thou art) food and prosperity, purified by the rains, rich in cows, that beyond the earth,<sup>6</sup> to which Varuna and Vāyu most resort, that which has for its body penance,<sup>7</sup> has Indra as its mightiest which milks ambrosia, with a thousand streams and countless letters.<sup>8</sup> These, O hymn, are thy powers, there are the powers of speech.<sup>9</sup> With these for me now milk the great wealth of ambrosia. Prajāpati created this prayer, the essence of the Vedas. With it may I obtain all; let it win all desires greatly, Thou art *śūh*, *śūhuk*, and *śar*, the three, thou art the Veda.<sup>10</sup> Milk, O prayer,<sup>11</sup> children for me. Life and breath milk for me. Cattle and folk milk for me. Prosperity and glory milk for me. The world (to come), splendour of renown, courage, prosperity in sacrifice, milk for me.<sup>12</sup> All this he makes the Adhvaryu repeat, if he does not know (the Mantras). Then being urged on to sacrifice (by the Adhvaryu, who says), 'Om,<sup>13</sup> offer the Soma singer of the hymn,'

*paṇḍit* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 716), the nom. of the participle, or *paṇḍit*, reading *dhendh*. The Jaiminiya Upaniṣad *paṇḍit* may arise from a misreading of *s* or *ś*.

<sup>6</sup> *śūhagām* may mean 'prosperous cows', and *varidhātum*, 'purifying by rains'. *Pythi vyuparṇa* is *yupasya mīlam* (Sayana). If this is correct (cf. n. 3), the next adjective may belong to it or to *śūhagām*, but it is much more likely to be merely 'beyond the earth', as in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad, which has *Varunapariyatana* and *annakubhān*, 'pleased through food'.

<sup>7</sup> Apparently we must follow Sayana and supply *munisarpayata* or something similar. The verses are late in character, and *śūhagām* might mean 'lean through penance', but the translation of Oriel 'having penance as a body' is at least as probable (cf. the accent). The *śūh* is blindly praised.

<sup>8</sup> *Dhānani* is taken as nom. neut. Sayana renders it as with *gotulam*. *Ayutakaram* is due, he says, to the fact that there are so many syllables in the *dahanaprukarana*, *zastān* *paṇḍit* are *sahasradhānani* (Tait. n. 3). Somkhū, 1, 2, 3; 1, 3; Bhattacharya Somkhū, 1, 2, 3. He takes *ayutakaram* and *sahasradhānani* as accus. agreeing with *amritam*. They are perhaps more probably nominative.

<sup>9</sup> Or, as Sayana, 'these sounds are thy powers.' Bloomfield (*1 edic. Concordance*, p. 300\*) reads *śūhāśūhā śar*. The other seems simpler. *śūh* and *śar* are easily identified, or rather the latter lies at the base of the former. For *apṛṣṭam*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 921, 925, 573 c, Delbrück *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 352, 353.

<sup>10</sup> The conjecture *veda* for *veda* is easy, but unnecessary, cf. § 11 on III, 2, 4, RV, II, 6, 7, I 45, 6, II, 3, 6, III, 14, 3, etc. See also Asvalāyana Grhya Sutra, I, 15, 3 for *veda* 'to take *īrya*, &c., as a separate Mantra is wrong.

<sup>11</sup> Sayana takes *brahma* as accusative. I prefer to regard it as vocative, despite the apparent parallelism of the next sentences. For another neuter voc., cf. II 7, n. 1. Jāyayana Śrauta Sutra VII, 4 13 has *prajam me dhukṛta*, and also *djṛ me dhukṛta*, *śāśā me dhukṛta*. On the other hand Aitharvaveda, X, 8, 25 has *adhok — brahma va śāśā va*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. V, 3 3. The Adhvaryu utters the *prasta* twice, see Jāyayana Śrauta Sutra, I 5, 3 *ekakam prasta yajati*. See Sabharwal, *Agastya*, p. 58, for the phrase, and for the gen., Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 597 b, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 260.

uttering the cry, 'We who sacrifice,' he offers sacrifice with the usual<sup>12</sup> (stanza), and holding back as it were his breath, repeats a secondary *rasat*<sup>13</sup>. The accompaniment of the *rasat* is described elsewhere<sup>14</sup>. The Adhvaryu brings up the vessel containing the libation and the (three) *aligrāhya* bowls<sup>15</sup>. As soon as he perceives the food, the Hotr descends from the swing towards the east<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> RV, VII, 23, 1, see *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, V, 15, 23 *pūṣa somam Indra mandam iteṣa jayjā*, and VII, 11, 27. For the *agūḥ*, see *ibid.* 3, 5, 3, 4 *āgūḥ 3 āyadīr anuyajasyarjama* || 4 || 3 *3 yajamāha ity agūḥ*. See also Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, pp. 191 sq. *Heu- und Vollmondopfer*, p. 95, Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIV, 31, n. 1.

<sup>13</sup> *Anuvataḥ* is freely used as a compound verb in the *Antareya Brāhmaṇa* (I, 12, 4, &c.), *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, and *Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* and should be written as one word. *Vjānaya* is rendered *unconscious* *akṛto* by Sayana, who takes *nu* as *evā*. The reason for the expression *anuvataḥ* is given in Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature* p. 102, Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 351, n. 1. After the *yajya* the Hotr says: *deus 3 van 3 it* and *somay āgūḥ 2 it* 3 *van 3 rat*, thus making two *van 3 rat* cries. For the *vataḥkara*, cf. *Āpastamba, Yajñaparibhāṣā*, 96 (*S B E*, XXV, 341). The words *somay āgūḥ 2 it* occur in *Antareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 8, 4, 6 *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, V, 2, 19, and the brevity of this passage is only explained by the fact (see the following note) that the writer clearly knew the *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra* (cf. *Introd.*, p. 19) of the relation of *Gṛhya Sūtra* and *Śrauta Sūtra* in the case of *Āvalāyana* and *Śākhāyana*. Oldenberg, who once thought the evidence was in favour of assigning the two *Sūtras* of *Śākhāyana* to different epochs, has now abandoned the attempt and leaves the question open (see *S B E*, XXV, 5, 6 XXV, xxxiv sq.), while I am inclined to think that there is no evidence worth counting against the traditional authorship in either case.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, I, 5, 17 *rug eṣṭa sāha oja mayā prañiṣṇau ity rasat-karam uktoḥśṭi unumantrayati*! This is a direct reference. Cf. also *Antareya Brāhmaṇa*, III, 8, 9 where it reads *ten anumantrayati eva oja sāha oja mayā prañiṣṇau ity atman eva tad kṛta tacam ca prañiṣṇau ca itihopayati sate iyuk sarvagṛhṇaya*. The reference here might be supposed to be to the *Brāhmaṇa* passage and not to the *Śrauta Sūtra*, but the use of *anumantrayati* and the mode of reference are hopelessly opposed to this view. The style of reference is reminiscent of *Āvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*, I, 1, 1 *uktāni eāśānikāni grāhyāni vakyīmāḥ* which is a clear reference to the *Śrauta Sūtra*, and I think an assertion of the identity of authorship. It may be noted that, although Oldenberg (*S B E*, XXV, 158) clearly indicates that he has some novel view on the relations of *Sāṅkhya* and *Āvalāyana*, he does not (in *S B E*, XXV) carry out his promise of discussing the point, save that (*ibid.* p. xxv n. 2) he alludes to the fact that *Āvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*, II, 7, 16, quotes a *yajñagūḍa* by *Sāṅkhya*. This of course in no way contradicts the view of the relation as pupil and teacher reflected on the tradition of the *Kāthīśāritiśāra* and recorded in the most precise terms by *Śaṅkara*. The B version of the 1 *śhaddevatā*, which probably was composed by a pupil of *Sāṅkhya* distinctly quotes *Āvalāyana*, which suits the tradition admirably (p. 293, note\*).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. *Āvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra* VII, 3, 22, *Śākhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, VII, 22, 20, *anuvadmanam āgūḥjāt*. They are drawn 'over and above' (ab) *Mahe, tad jāt*, *id.*, 235, Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 402, n. 4, XII, 6, n. 1.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. I, 2, 45 *Śākhāyana Āraṇyaka*, II, 17, *Śrauta Sūtra*, XVII, 21, 6, 7. For *rat* *ī na* with *rat*, cf. *Delbrück, Alindische Syntax* pp. 298 sq., *Speyer, Indische und Sanskrit Syntax*, 41, 197, 227. This case illustrates admirably the origin of the use in its relation of *us* and the 2nd person, see also *Maitrīyaṇi Samhitā*, II, 2, 7, *Iti, 2, 9, Taittirīya Samhitā* II, 2, 1, 1, *Jā + S*, 199.

Then they tie up the swing to the west that it may not slay the reciter when about to eat. For the Hotr eats seated on the place of the swing. Then the Hotr consumes the (libation in the) vessel with the words uttered in response,<sup>17</sup> 'May speech, the deity, rejoice in the Soma,' 'May Soma, the King, shower life on me for my breath,' 'May my breath milk mightily all life.' The third pressing (in this rite) is taken over<sup>18</sup> from the last day of the Abhiplava rite, except as regards the hymn containing *nuśāḥ* addressed to the All-gods (RV, I, 89). In its place are inserted forty-one verses of the 'water' hymn of Dirghatamas, 'Of that noble grey sacrificer' (RV, I, 164) and the hymn *anobhadrīya* (RV, I, 89). The strophe and antistrophe of the Vaisvadeva Śāstra are taken over from the one day form<sup>19</sup> (the Visvaji). If the Yajñayajña Saman is omitted,<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> *Upar term* is explained by Sayana as *itaranyajñapureṣakana*, the word occurs often in Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, but not in a parallel passage. Cf, however, XVIII, 1, 12. The verse *veg dāḥ (gustad) somayā arpyatu* is found in Vajasaneyi Samhita, VIII, 37, and elsewhere. Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance* p. 853<sup>b</sup>. *Ja me, &c.*, is a quasi-verse. It is tempting to render *ayuh* = if it were a dative, 'may Soma ram on me for life for breath,' and it might possibly be so taken as the sentence is a Mantra and therefore not to be judged by the ordinary rules of prose (cf Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, III, viii). In that case *ayuhpranaya* would not be a *śaṭpurnsa* compound, since 'the breath of life' is not in Sanskrit *ayuhprana*, not yet a *dramita*, but rather a case in which the mere base is accepted as sufficient to denote the case relation when followed by a case form in a parallel word cf e.g. RV, I, 26, 9, where Max Müller would so render (see Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 15) *amṛta mārīyanam*, and see Pischel, *Vedische Studien* I 60 sq., 215 sq., Jacobs, *Gott gel. Anc.*, 1880, p. 855, Wachsmagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xvii, and II, 1, 157, who accepts this view of RV, I, 26, 9. Cf, however, Aitareya Brahmana I 6 on II, 14 where *saranyuḥ saranyutvaya* occurs. The gen is one of partitive force, cf Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 160, Monro, *Homeric Grammar*, p. 146. For loc with *at*, cf Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 3, 20 for acc. caz. in *Ind. Stud.*, IX 293.

<sup>18</sup> For the Abhiplava, see Āśvalayana Śrāuta Sūtra, VII, 6, Eggeling *S B E*, XLVI, 403. It has six days. The hymn referred to is RV, I, 89. cf Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 21, 8. The hymn, RV, I, 164, 1, is called *śahā* also in Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 18, and Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 21, 7. It is of course derived from *v* 41, *gauri mīmāṣa śahimsa śahats*, cf. also Eghaddevata IV, 43.

<sup>19</sup> The Vaisvadeva Śāstra begins therefore with RV, V, 82, 1-3, 4-6. The contents of it and the Agnimaruta are given in full in I, 5, 3, which explains the brevity with which they are here treated. Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 22 (cf Śākhayana Āranyaka, II, 18), gives the Śāstra as RV, V, 82, 1-3, 4-6, IV, 53, I, 160, I, 161, I, 164 (the whole), and I, 89 with *nuśāḥ*, and V, 53, 5, as a *paridhanya*. *Anobhadrīya* is used as a name of I 89 also in Eghadhana, I, 20, 5, but Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance* p. 169<sup>b</sup>) does not cite this passage, which is earlier.

<sup>20</sup> The Agnimaruta for the Śākhayana is given in detail in Śākhayana Śrāuta Sūtra, XLIII, 23, cf Āranyaka, II, 18. It consists of RV, III, 3, V, 55, the Yajñayajña or a substitute, VI, 48, not noted by Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 735<sup>a</sup>) who omits also any reference to this passage, I, 241. If the Yajñayajña Saman is employed, the Agnimaruta Śāstra constitutes itself in the Aitareya thus RV, III, 3, I, 43, 6, V, 45, VI, 48, 1 and 2, VII, 17, 11 and 12, I, 99, 1, 2, 9, 1, &c, the rest being as in the *prārthā* (Śāyana). If the Jāṇā Saman is

then the strophe and antistrophe (in the Āgṇimāruta Śāstra) consist of the six stanzas beginning, 'O Agni, thy fame, thy strength' (RV, X, 140, 1) when the Iṇḍa Saman is employed (three stanzas being used). If more (than three) are used in this Saman, then so many are employed (in the Śāstra) as the antistrophe, beginning, 'Agni, for ourselves = it were' (RV., X, 21, 1). Thus is completed the Mahāvṛata and thus dry and the Agnistoma.<sup>21</sup> At the proper time they should carry the swing to the bath, and burn together the seats.

3 No one<sup>2</sup> who has not been initiated should recite the Mahāvṛata, nor

used, then for the two *pragatkar*, VI, 48, 1 and 2, and VII, 17, 11 and 12, are substituted X, 140, 1-2, and 4-6 respectively, being the two parts of the Iṇḍa Saman. If, however, all the six stanzas (X, 140, 1-6) are used for the *sattriya*, then X, 21, 1-6, must form the *anuvāṇa*. So Śaṅkha yana, who gives further variations. For the Iṇḍa cf Oldenberg *Gott gel Ans*, 1908 p 714.

<sup>21</sup> The Mahāvṛata is a form of the Agnistoma and so in a sense the Agnistoma is finished. The utensils and the swing are both cleansed, while the *vedi* and the *śṛṅṣ* are both consumed by fire. Śaṅkha yana Śrauta Sūtra XVIII, 24, develops the final close of the ceremony in some detail. The Āraṇyaka, II, 16, has *śed Agnistomam saristhale*. The burning points clearly to an original sun spell. The question, however, has recently been raised whether the use of fire = not merely peculiar, cf Fraser, *Adams, Atlas, Omis* p 151, n 4, Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, I, 56 n 3. The usual view is that both the burning and the waving of torches in such rites are intended to evoke heat by magic. Cf Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, p 84.

<sup>2</sup> Sayana as usual, ignores the difficulties of this passage. (1) The words *ity eke* most probably refer to the whole passage (cf III 2, 4, n 2), because the very first prohibition contradicts the passage above V, 1, 5 n 5, when the case of an *adikṛta* Hotṛ is deliberately discussed. The sense then must be as Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 367, n 1) takes it, that (1) no one but a *dīkṣita* can recite, and even he only (2) if there is a *citragṇa*, and (3) a year long *sattri* and (4) not even he for another unless he be father or teacher. It may be noted that Śaṅkha yana Āraṇyaka, I 1, prohibits recitation to another, save in the case of *sattrins* and of a father and a teacher, which corresponds with the rule here, since *sattrins* of course are entitled to recite for one another. But *ibid*, 1, 5 and Śrauta Sūtra XVII, 13, 6, regard a *citragṇa* as optional, perhaps a later idea (cf Weber, *Ind Stud* XIII, 217, n.). The rule of those here cited thus excludes the Mahāvṛata as anything but a *sattri*. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 1, 2, loc sts on an altar at the Mahāvṛata (Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII xxv, n 2). But it should be noted that this is inconsistent with the exception of the father and the teacher, for they could only be concerned—being *ex hypothesi* not *sattrins* = an *ekāṇa* or *akṛma* rite. Possibly however the view that one can recite for a father or teacher does not contemplate the case of an *ekāṇa* or *ekāṇa*, but means that in a *sattri* the sacrificer may carry out the sacrifice for the benefit of his father or teacher though they are not initiated and cannot take part themselves, this view I incline to think the most probable, despite Dr Friedlander's view (p 29, n 2). It cannot mean that, the teacher or father being *adikṛta*, the Hotṛ recited for them only, for in the Mahāvṛata all the *sattrins* equally obtain the benefits of the rite (cf Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, xxv 57), and therefore are forbidden to perform for others outside the circle of the initiated,<sup>2</sup> cf Śatapatha

<sup>2</sup> It may be noted that the prohibition of performing sacrifices by other than Brahmins is ascribed in the Śatapatha Brahmana, II, 3 1, 39 (cf Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 14 11, Max

should he recite it when there is no altar, nor should one recite it for another, nor if it does not last a year, so say some. Only one may recite it for a father or a teacher, for that is recited for oneself<sup>2</sup>. (The only<sup>3</sup> utterance (of the

Bṛhmana, IV, 5, 2, 12 and 13, X, 5, 2, 5. (2) Presumably for this reason Sayana renders the passage as equivalent to 'no one who is not *dīkṣita* should recite the Mahāvratā at another's sacrifice (i.e. an *akṣina* or *ekakṣa*) unless there is a *citragṇi*, or unless that other is a father or a teacher. His explanation is that the Mahāvratā is of three forms, *ekakṣa*, *akṣina*, and *sattra*. As in the *sattra*, the *yajamāna* and Hotṛ are identical, then the *dīkṣa* is automatic. In the other two rites the Hotṛ is not the *yajamāna*, and may be either *dīkṣita* or *adīkṣita*. In the Agnisoma, &c., if *svārthe* he is *dīkṣita* as these are Soma sacrifices (cf. Hillebrandt, *Relig. Literatur*, p. 125). If the sacrifice is not a Soma one then he is not. Only the *dīkṣita* can perform at a *parakīya mahāvratāharmā*, and he only if there is a *citragṇi*. But all this is very difficult and inconsistent. The *matamattara* *ity eke* he takes as a separate prohibition confined to one school. But this seems less likely. (3) Max Müller, *S B E*, I, 265, 267, takes the passage thus: 'No one who is *adhīkṣita*, uninitiated, should recite it for another person, nor should he do so, when the Mahāvratā is performed without (or with) an altar, or if it does not last one year'. But this hardly makes sense, since an *adīkṣita* can never recite if there is a *sattra*, and the construction of the sentence shows that the series of prohibitions is not directed to an *adīkṣita* but to a priest in general. He is not to recite if *adīkṣita*, nor if there is no fire, &c. Dr. Friedlander, on Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 1, follows Max Müller, without commenting on the difficulties. (4) The only other possibility is to render, 'No one who is not initiated must recite, nor must one recite if there is no fire, nor for another (i.e. allowing *akṣina* and *ekakṣa* if by chance the *yajamāna* is the Hotṛ in fact)'. Some say, 'nor if it be not a *sattra*. One may recite for a father, &c. In this case the passage confirms in part the view that there was probably a *citragṇi* at the *ekakṣa* and *akṣina* rites, Eggeling *S B E* XLIII, xxv.

<sup>2</sup> Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 1, has *atmano* *has* *asya* *tae* *chastam* *bhara-ti*. The one gives the body, the other learning. *Atmano* here is no doubt correct as less easy than *atmane*. It is a predicative possessive gen., as in I, 2, 2, 2. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 298, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 64. For *asya*, cf. Caland, *Ueber das vi. Sutra des Bandh* pp. 44-45.

<sup>3</sup> Savana says *atra* *bṛhad* *vāyuntaram* *adhijate*. This can hardly refer to recitation, and throws grave doubt on Winternitz's interpretation of a similar phrase in Haradatta (*Mantra-praśā* I, xiv). The passage is given in all the MSS., but it cannot be original. In addition to being quite out of place, it is almost unintelligible here. It is a general description of the *prasa* of the Adhvaryu in the case of *Sastras*, whether accompanied by *Āśvīdāmanikhyacamanas* or not. In the case of the Hotṛ's *Sastras* the *prasa* is *uktā* a *yajamāna*. In the case of the Hotṛikas, what it is is disputed. Sayana says (1) some supply *uktā* *ai* *yajamānam* (cf. Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, IX, 23-33 (*śamanīya*), 14, 22 (*śamanam*), Apastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 27, 19 (*śamanīya*), 28, 24 (*śamanīya*)) and make this the *prasa*. (2) others, so 'yam *arthak* *prākrita* *eva* *prāpta* *iti* *mātra*, reject the passage, (3) others repeat *uktā* *ai* *yajamāna*, and assume the mention here is *hotṛānam* *lastre* *vaiśvadehānartham*. The second alternative is the most probable. The words *uktā* *ai* *śamanam*, which appear in the text after *hotṛānam*, are certainly spurious and cannot have been read even by Sayana, whose note would be

Müller *S B E*, XXX, 321), to the fact that Brahmins only can eat the remains of a sacrifice. The reason is no doubt a reflex of the doctrine of the presence of the divinity in the sacrifice (which in certain cases forbids any eating whatever, e.g. *Āśvalay* *śrauta* Sūtra IV, 8, 31), for which see my article in the *J. A. S.* 1907, pp. 939-94. 1. obertso . . . of *Sena*, I, 276-94.



Adhvaryu) on the Hotr's Śāstras, whether accompanied or not by libations for Naraśamsa, is 'Offer the Soma with the hymn', and it also occurs in the Hotraka's Śāstras) Thus day one should not teach to one who is not a regular pupil, and has not been so for a year, assuredly not to one who has not been so for 11 year, nor to one who is not a *brahmacārin* and does not belong to the same school,<sup>4</sup> assuredly not to one who does not belong to the same school, nor to one who has not come to that place.<sup>5</sup> There should not be more than one saying or twice, twice only.<sup>6</sup> 'One man should tell it to one,' says Jāṭikarnya. 'Not to a child or a man in the third stage of life'.<sup>7</sup> Nor standing to one standing, nor walking to one walking, nor lying to one lying nor seated on a couch to one so seated, but seated on the ground to one so seated (should the teacher teach). Nor (should the pupil) lean backwards,<sup>8</sup> nor forwards, nor be over clothed, nor adopt postures, but he should raise his knees, without wearing special apparel, and so learn. He should not learn when he has eaten flesh, or seen blood, or a dead body, or done what is unlawful, or anointed (his eyes) or oiled or rubbed his body, or had himself shaved, or bathed, or has put on colour, or put on a wreath, or had intercourse, or written,<sup>9</sup> or obliterated

unintelligible if he had had them before him. The reason for their insertion is obvious. For the libations of *L. Agnistoma* p. 220. The gen. is presumably partitive, cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 67. V 3, 2, n. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Gautama Sutra, XIV, 27, and Bühler's note in his translation (*S B E*, II), where he differentiates it from *śāśādhya*. Here, however, it is perhaps used in that usual sense.

<sup>5</sup> Where the teacher lives. He is not to go to the pupil's house.

<sup>6</sup> Because it is so sacred. According to Sayana, Jāṭikarnya insists on one lecture only to one person at a time, and the same teacher to avoid *sampradāya* *śikṣā*.

<sup>7</sup> This sentence must also belong to Jāṭikarnya. This seems the proper way to interpret the str. which, however Sayana explains as *śiṣyaprayuktanistadhavamāptyarthak*, and so Max Müller takes it. For the idea cf. Manu, VIII, 66, &c.

<sup>8</sup> I e. lean on a *kūḍi* (or a wall, &c., *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, I 2, 6, 17), or rest with his hands on a stick (on the ground *Āpastamba*, I c., 17). The other readings follow Sayana, who gives *nichchīdāyokramana* for *navratyama akramya*, cf. *Atvalayana Śrāuta Sūtra* XII 8, 19. For *śrīrāṣa*, cf. Manu, VIII 23. *samastanga*. For *napatena karayitva* he has *nadhānīyanta nadi* cf. *Sāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra* VI, 1 6, and for the syntax, Dellrich, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 124 sq. He takes *nadhān* as referring to the eyes. *Varnakānamūḍhya* he refers to sandal or saffron being smeared on, for *varma* cf. Böhtlingk, *Dict.*, VI 24. For *onapātrita* *ibid.*, I, 41. For these rules, cf. *Āpastamba*, I, 2 6, 23-27.

<sup>9</sup> These translations follow Sayana and Max Müller. Though they no longer 'seem to be the earliest mention of actual writing in Sanskrit literature', in view of the discoveries of Bühler, *Indische Paläographie* and *Ind. Stud.* III (1898), Hoernle, *J. A S B*, LXIX, pt. 1, Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, ed. VII and others they are interesting. Writing on palm leaves may be more recent rather than on wood. The violent repugnance to writing shown here and elsewhere is certainly in favour of this view, accepted by Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p. 16) and Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Lit.*, I, 29), that writing first came into use on the South Western Coast through commerce and that MSS. are later. For a different but very improbable view, cf. R. Shamasastry, *Ind. Ant.* 1906, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 426, 427.

writing. 'He should not finish learning this in one day,' says Jātukarnya. 'He should do so,' says Galava. 'He should finish all before the sets of eighty trisuchs, and resting<sup>10</sup> in another place learn the rest,' says Āgñiveśyayana. Where he learns this, he should learn nothing else, but where he learns something else he may at will learn this there also. He who does not study this does<sup>11</sup> not become a *śrutaka*, even though he study much else, yet if he study not this, he does not become a *śrutaka*. Nor should he forget this, even though he forgets something else, he should not forget this. Assuredly<sup>12</sup> never should he forget this. If he forget not this, let him know that it is enough for himself<sup>13</sup>. Let him know that truly it is enough<sup>14</sup>. He who knows this should not communicate<sup>15</sup> nor dine nor amuse himself with one who knows this not.

Now<sup>16</sup> we shall set forth the rules of study. When the old water about

<sup>10</sup> *Śamayanaṇaḥ* is taken as *samajayan* by Śaṅkara, which is possible. I follow Max Müller on the passage as a whole, cf. Oldenberg *Prolegomena*, p. 193. On the form Āgñiveśyayana, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1219. It occurs as a name of a grammarian in the Taittiriya Prātisākhya XIV 32. Āgñiveśya occurs in the Vāṁśas in Bhāṣṭaranyaka Upaniṣad, II 6, 2, and IV, 5, 2 in both Kāṇva and Mādhyandina Śāktas (Max Müller *S B E*, XV, 118, n. 1, 186, n.) Jātukarnya (the word is found in the *gāṇa*, *gārgodī*) occurs in the same passages with Galava. The spelling seems clearly Jātū<sup>9</sup> though in Max Müller's translation the two forms Jātū<sup>9</sup> and Jātū<sup>9</sup> occur. Jātukarnya occurs in Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka VIII, 10 and frequently in the Śāṅkhayana Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras (III 30 1). Kātyāyana's Śrauta Sūtra the Vajrasaneyi Prātisākhya, and in Kauṣṭaki Brahmana, XXVI 5. Galava is known to Nirukta IV, 3, Bhāṣṭaranyaka, II 6 3 IV, 5 3, Bhāṣṭaranyaka, and Paṇini as a grammarian. see Max Müller *Āgveda Prātisākhya* p. 6.

<sup>11</sup> 'Should not become' is Śaṅkara's version. Literally it must be 'is not a (true) *śrutaka*'. Cf. Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra I 2, 8, 27. The exact force of the optative is rather doubtful. It may be that it is the indefinite use of which examples undoubtedly occur in Sanskrit (cf. Speller, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 183 also in III 2, 1 n. 1 and *Introduct.*, p. 61) or it may be an opt in protasis with the apod. in the indic. to denote the certainty of the result though the rule of similarity of mood is usually strictly observed in the older language. see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar* § 381 f. who enforces his rule partly by alterations in the text of the Māhātmya Samhita (see his review of v. Schroeder's ed., *P A O S* Oct. 1887) *J R A S*, 1909, p. 153.

<sup>12</sup> Śaṅkara says that this is read by some only. It is in all the MSS., but is an easy addition. Cf. n. 14. As here and above follows a negative sentence and is practically merely an emphatic negative as usual in classical Sanskrit, Speller *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 240, *Sanskrit Syntax* § 402 R 1, cf. Caland, *Ueber das vierte Sutra des Baudh.*, p. 51.

<sup>13</sup> Śaṅkara renders *puruṣārthaya* and Max Müller gives as possible 'for acquiring a knowledge of the self'. For the dat. cf. II 4 3. *Ātman* however is merely the ordinary reflexive. Speller, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 127, Delbrück *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 203 263.

<sup>14</sup> Thus again Śaṅkara says, is read only by some and as it is one of those easy additions it cannot be accepted as genuine. Naturally a chapter of this kind lies open beyond others to such interpolations as this.

<sup>15</sup> Śaṅkara, *vaśaṁ* 'unmolested' or 'truly with' (*vaśaṁ gṛhṇāṁ gṛhṇāṁ* 'from the grasp'), 'the sense is probably 'enter into discussion with *unmolested* and *unmolested* here are clearly compounds of Wackernagel's, *Altindische Grammatik* II, I 68.

<sup>16</sup> Then come general rules for all Vedic study not for the Māhātmya alone. These are found both

the roots of the trees has been dried up,<sup>17</sup> he should not study, nor in the forenoon,<sup>18</sup> when the shadows meet, nor in the afternoon, nor when a thick cloud has risen; and when rain<sup>19</sup> falls out of season he should stop his study of the Veda<sup>20</sup> for three nights, nor in this time<sup>21</sup> should he tell tales, nor even

■ Gṛhya and Dharma Sūtras (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, xxxiv, xxxv); Khādīra Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11; cf. Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 8, VI, 1; Hillebrandt, *Ritual Literature*, p. 86 and ref.; Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9-11; Gautama Dharma Sūtra, XVI, with Bühler's notes.

<sup>17</sup> The time after the full moon of Pausa, i.e. January-February is meant, cf. Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Naratra*, II, 328 sq.; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 77, n; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9, 2, with Bühler's note, Manu, IV, 95, Yājñavalkya, I, 142, 143. The four months after the full moon of Āśāḍha are forbidden in bhāṅhāyana, VI, 2, 1. The term is five months, beginning in the middle of Śravana, Gautama Dharma Sūtra, XVI, 1 sq.; of Trauṣṭapada, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3, 1; Khādīra Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 2, 16. Śravana is also given by Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3, 2, 3; Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 3, 1; Pārāśara Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 20, 2; Hiranyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 18, 1. The *timeus upa nopite* is very unusual, but *upapurāṇa* would be almost equally strange, though not impossible. *Katsodaka* is a curious expression, as explained by Śāyana. The separation of prefix and verb is (see Celard, *Ueber das vi. Sutra des Boudh*, pp. 48, 49) rare in the late Sūtra style and is difficult to assume here, though this may be quoted from an older (metrical) text. *Upapurāṇa* seems elsewhere unknown in the sense 'somewhat (?) old'. Nothing is indeed more characteristic of the Vedic Sanskrit than the separation of particle and verb. Holtzmann (*Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata*, p. 48) says that the only example<sup>22</sup> in the Epic occurs in a pseudo Vedic hymn to the A. viii, I, 3, 62: *drud adhi tūve vṛatāḥ*. Even the Bhāṣya has no certain case of such separation. On Jacob's theories of the beginning of the year (*Festzug an Roth*, pp. 68-74), see Whitney, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, lxxxv sq.; Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 238-249 (dates of the commencement of Vedic study at p. 249). Thibaut, *ibid.*, XXIV, 85-100; Oldenberg *Z. D. M. G.*, L, 45: sq.

<sup>18</sup> When study is permissible (hardly 'at any time' as Max Müller), he must not so study in the forenoon or afternoon, when shadows are meeting, i.e. he should begin at sunrise when the shadows first appear, and cease before sunset when they again disappear (Śāyana).

<sup>19</sup> For the case of a cloud, cf. Āpastamba, I, 3, 21, 31. Rain out of season (*ibid.*, 27, Manu, III, 104, combines the two into a cloud out of the ordinary in the rains) is explained by Śāyana as rain falling in months other than Śravana and Bhāṣṭapada, August and September, or according to the Sūptikāra, under Nakṣatras other than the 13 from Ārdra to Jyesthā.

<sup>20</sup> The study of Vedāṅgas, like *vyākaraṇa*, is not prohibited (Śāyana). He adds *andāḥ śiṣṭhāṇāṃ trayodaśanāṅgasūtraparimitāṃśaṃ bāṇāṃ vṛtikalāraṇam abhyūpāya tato 'nyatra vṛttāṃ sāyam akālāvṛttimāṣṭam tṛatradhīyānamāryaṇam echanti*.

<sup>21</sup> *Arman* is vague. Śāyana gives either *adhiyānāṃśaṃ śāṅkhye* or *mahāvratadhīyānanakale*. The rendering 'at that time' of Max Müller is perhaps intended to refer to the *tṛatratram*, since the translation continues 'not even during the night, nor should he glory in his knowledge', since *āya* seems to be taken with *ratrat*. *Tṛatratram*, of course, includes days, so that the rendering is quite possible, though probably the first of Śāyana's alternatives is correct. For the acc., cf. Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 28 and ref. The note is one of separation, *ibid.*, § 33; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 283. The usual case is the abl., Speyer, § 32; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 446, who ignores this passage.

<sup>22</sup> But cf. the warning as to Holtzmann's accuracy in Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 246, and Winternitz's review there cited. In this case the fact seems substantially correct.

at night at this time be fair to set them forth<sup>22</sup> 'This'<sup>23</sup> is the name of this great being. He who knows thus 'this' as the name of it, becomes *brahman*

<sup>22</sup> The text reads *mayā vātrau ca na ca kīrtayiset* Sayana, followed by Max Müller, takes this as consisting of two sentences (1) *mayā vātrau ca*, (2) *na ca kīrtayiset*. Sayana renders, (1) *kimāya mahāvratasya jñānam vātrau na kīrtayet*, (2) *kimā mahāvratābhāṣā 'ham hi evam jñānamādhye kīrtim api nechet*. Max Müller's version, which is much more probable, is cited above. But 'not even at night' would more properly be *na vātrau ca* than *na vātrau ca* of III, 1, 3 *nāstīdyaṃ ca*. Further *kīrtayiset* is quite impossible. The form required is *akīrtayiset*, and no easier error than *ca* *akīrtayis* *et* being changed to *ca* *ca kīrtayiset* can well be conceived. Then the whole must mean 'I think, "not even at night in this time (probably *adhyāyane* *śādhyaṃ*) should one be fair to proclaim (speak)"'. The *adhyāyana* takes place during the day (see above) and neither then nor even at night, when the *adhyāyana* stops, is the telling of tales to be permitted. For the form *akīrtayiset*, an opt. desc. from a denominative (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1036), see Whitney, § 1058. Such forms are very rare, hence the non-recognition of this case by the commentators. Cf also Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III, 30 *varā kīrtayisām* where Aufrecht (p. 430) proposes to read *ekāḥḥa jñānam* (presumably by haplography for *varā ekāḥḥa jñānam*), I, 24.5 *śūdrādhāyiset* (cf Leitch, *Jaini*, p. 32 n). Apastamba Śrouta Sūtra VII, 24.5 *kūḥḥakīrtayiset*, Kaṭhaka Smṛiti, VII 3 *pīpāyayiset*, *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 264, Holtzmann, *Grammatische aus dem Mahābhārata*, p. 46.

<sup>23</sup> Sayana renders followed by Max Müller, "Thus, the *kīrti* *adhyāyana* *śādhyaṃ* *mahāvratā* *śādhyaṃ* *ru*, thus learned (= *śi*) is the name of the *parameśvara*." He explains that the Veda produces *brahman* and so is identified with it and its sacred character resulting from this power causes the long list of *nyāyas* here given. This cannot be right. The word *śi* is the name of the *brahman*, see I 3.4 where this is most expressly stated.

The end of the section renders it probable that it may be accepted as coming from Śaṃsaka. Otherwise the passage would be suspect since it contains passages whose genuineness was doubted even before Sayana and the possibility of it all being an interpolation cannot be entirely excluded. The use of *brahman* is striking especially in the peed, and confirms the view that *brahman* is not to be found save on good grounds in any early texts. For Atharvaveda II, 35.2, see Weber *Ind. Stud.* VII 1340 for Maitrayani Saṃhitā, II, 9.1 see v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 91, n.1. Muir, *Texts* V, 373 finds him in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa VI 3.6, 9 &c, but needlessly. Hopkins *Religion of India* p. 295, and Oldenberg *Buddha*, p. 30 n.2, are vague. The *St. Petersburg Dr.*, I, 136, cites Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, II, 2, 17, 1, as the oldest passage, but Sayana's view may be wrong and none of the passages in Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 168 are necessarily so taken. It occurs, of course in the Taittiriya Āranyaka II, but that is not early, though its lateness has been needlessly exaggerated on insufficient grounds. Eggeeling (cf *S. B. E.*, XLIV, 355) finds him nowhere in the comparatively late Śatapatha, though he appears in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (cf Deussen *Phil. of the Upaniṣads*, pp. 172 sq.), and in the later Upaniṣads and in the earliest Buddhist texts, which however can only be doubtfully dated.

# APPENDIX

## ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA VII-XV

THIS Appendix contains the text of Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII-XV, edited from the Berlin MS Orient, fol 630 (A)<sup>1</sup> and Bodleian MS Sansk n 2<sup>2</sup> (B). The Bodleian MS, which is at least 200 years old, save for ff 65 and 87 which were replaced in A.D. 1781, is extremely accurate on the whole, and the text which it presents is in most cases also supported by parallel readings in other Upanisads and Āranyakas. In many cases the old method of denoting the *e*, *ai*, *o*, *au* is retained, but not consistently, showing that the MS belongs to the period of transition to the new style. Frequent errors are (1) the reduction of double consonant to single, e.g. *tare dvisaniam*, XII, 20, (2) the insertion of a needless *h*, e.g. *sapatnaḥkṣayanam*, XII, 19 this may be a mere graphical sign as apparently in the Manava Grhya Sūtra<sup>3</sup>, (3) haplography, e.g. *pramiye tar(d)*, XII, 20, hence probably *bhaviṣyati* for *bhaviṣyati* in IX, 7, (4) the writing of *ī* for *i*, e.g. *maricir*, VIII, 7. Many, though not all, of these errors have been corrected in a later hand, or sometimes by the first hand in the margin. The most serious source of error is probably omission, see e.g. VIII, 2, n 7, 4, n 3. As usual *cā* is written for *cā* in all cases,<sup>4</sup> and *l* replaces *l*, I have restored *cā* and *l*. Further in the text is attached to the Rgveda, I have treated two verbal prefixes as each separate and accented, as usual in the text of the Rgveda<sup>5</sup>. Both MSS agree in several errors, e.g. the omission of *irayasya* and the reading *sicyet* (for *sicyeta*) in VIII, 2.

The following list gives the correspondence between the two texts of the Aitareya and the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyakas —

AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA	ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA
Śanti verses (pp 75, 76)	VII 1
III, 1, 1	VII, 2
III 1, 2	VII, 3
—	VII, 4-7

<sup>1</sup> See Weber, *Berlin Catal*, II, 5. Keith *J P A S*, 1908 p 363, n 2.

<sup>2</sup> Described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, pp 59-60. Purchased in 1886 for the Library through Dr Thibaut.

<sup>3</sup> Kinnier, *Manava Grhya Sutra*, pp xxxv, xxxvi.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p 10, n 2, Macdonell, *J R A S*, 1907 p 1105.

<sup>5</sup> Macdonell *Vedic Grammar*, p 107.



hiḥ 1 sa ja enam etam samhitam tēdī samdhyaḥ prajā paśubhir jaśasa brah̥ṇa  
tarcasena stargena lokena tartam ayur eti ॥ 5 ॥<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 6 A B. Not in Āitareya Aranyaka.

Prithivī purtarupam dyaus ultararupam kākā samhitā Radhayaḥ 1 ity adhi  
dātātām 1 athadhīatmam 1 tāk purtarupam mana ultararupam atma samhitā 1  
sa ja enam etam samhitam tēdī samdhyaḥ prajā paśubhir jaśasa brahmatarcae  
sena stargena lokena tartam ayur eti ॥ 6 ॥<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 7 A B. Not in Āitareya Aranyaka.

Vāk purtarupam mana ultararupam tīḥya samhitā Pauskarasadiḥ 1 sa ja  
evam etam samhitam tēdī samdhyaḥ prajā paśubhir jaśasa brahmatarcae  
stargena lokena tartam ayur eti ॥ 7 ॥<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 8 A B. Not in Āitareya Aranyaka.

Athāto 'nuyāharāḥ 1 prano tamśa itī vīḥya 1 sa ja enam pranam tamśam  
brūvan param upatodec chakṣuṣan kākā cen manyeta pranam tamśam samadhāḥ  
pranam tamśam samdhīṣṭum<sup>2</sup> na lakṣoṣy aha<sup>3</sup> pranas tva tamśo haṣyaṣīty enam  
brūyat 1 atha ced aśakṣuṣan<sup>4</sup> manyeta pranam tamśam samadhīṣṭu tan naśakāḥ  
samdhātum pranas tva tamśo haṣyaṣīty evainam brūyat 1 jatha tu<sup>5</sup> katha ca brūvan  
tadbrūvan 1 a brūyat adhyāsam eva jat tat tatha syat 1 na tv evanyat kuśalāḥ brahma  
nam brūyat 1 aśadyumna etā brahmanam brūyit 1 naśadyumne cana<sup>6</sup> brahmanam  
brūvan namo itī brahmanebhya itā Sauratīro Māndukyaḥ ॥ 8 ॥<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> dhīṣṭam B pr m samadhīṣṭam B sec m. <sup>2</sup> artha B. <sup>3</sup> aśakṣuṣan B sec m.  
<sup>4</sup> nu (1) A B. <sup>5</sup> 1 a ca A B. <sup>6</sup> 9 A B. Sec A. areya Āranyaka III, 1, 4. head perhaps samadhām

Sa jadī prā am tamśam brūvanam param upatodec chakṣuṣan cen manyeta  
pranam<sup>1</sup> tamśam samadhīṣṭam<sup>2</sup> pranam tamśam samdhīṣṭum<sup>3</sup> na lakṣoṣy aha<sup>4</sup>  
prinas tva tamśo haṣyaṣīty enam brūyat 1 atha ced aśakṣuṣan<sup>5</sup> manyeta pranam  
tamśam samadhīṣṭu tam naśakāḥ samdhātum pranas tva tamśo haṣyaṣīty evainam  
brūyat 1 jatha tu katha ca brūvanam tadbrūvanam 1 a brūyat adhyāsam etā jat  
tat tatha syat 1 na tv anyat kuśalāḥ brahmanam brūyat 1 aśadyumna etā brahmanam  
brūyat 1 naśadyumne cana<sup>6</sup> brahmanam brūvan namo 'stu<sup>7</sup> brahmanebhya itī Saura  
tīro Māndukyaḥ ॥ 9 ॥<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> pro A B. <sup>2</sup> san aśīṣṭam B pr m. <sup>3</sup> aśīṣṭam B sec m. <sup>4</sup> artha B. <sup>5</sup> na ca A B.  
<sup>6</sup> Add B sec m. <sup>7</sup> 10 A B. Sec Āitareya Aranyaka III, 1, 4. The reading para for param  
would improve the sense, though no version of 9 and 10 is satisfactory. Cf Āitareya Aranyaka  
III, 1, 4 n 5.

Athāto nīrḍhujapratadaḥ<sup>1</sup> 1 prithivyāśānam nīrḍhujam dīvyāśānam prāṇnam  
antarikṣyāśānam udhāśāmatāreṇa 1 sa ja enam<sup>2</sup> nīrḍhujam brūvan param upatodec  
prithivīm devalam arāḥ prithatī tīḥ devala viśaṣīty enam brūyat 1 atha jadī  
prāṇnam brūvan param 1 paraded dīvam<sup>3</sup> devalam aro dyaus tīḥ devala viśaṣīty

enam brujāt i aha jady ubhayaṃantareṇa bruvan paratī upataded antarikṣam  
 dātām aro nīrīkṣam ita dātāḥ suyatīty enam<sup>1</sup> brujāt i jad hi samdānam  
 tīratīyāt<sup>2</sup> lan nirbhujasya rupam i aha jac chuddhe aksare abhivyāharati tat  
 prairnnasjygra u evobhayaṃantareṇodbhajam vyapītam bhavati<sup>3</sup> i annaśyākama nir  
 bhujam brujat svargakamāḥ prairnnam ubhayaśakama ubhayaṃantareṇa i sa ja  
 eman<sup>4</sup> nirbhujam bruvan param upataded acyastha atarabdhjam ahanabdhjam ity  
 enam brujāt i aha jady prairnnam bruvan param upataded acyastha ullarabdhjam  
 ahanabdhjam itī etānam brujāt i jas tu evobhayaṃantareṇaḥ tasya tasya  
 opavudāḥ i jathu tu katha ca bruvan tabruvan ca brujad abhyatham ca jat tat  
 tatha syāt i na tu etanyat kuśalad brahmanam brujāt i alidyumna etā brahmanam  
 brujāt i naldyumne cana<sup>5</sup> brahmanam brujm namo stu brahmanēdhyā itī  
 Sauratīro āśandukhyoḥ || 10 ||<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> nirbhujāt<sup>7</sup> A B <sup>2</sup> etā i (m for ass m lated n) B. <sup>3</sup> Add B sec m <sup>4</sup> evaṇam A  
 B pr m enam B sec m. <sup>5</sup> janti tam B. <sup>6</sup> bhavati B pr m <sup>7</sup> na ca A, B <sup>8</sup> 11 A, B  
 See Aitareya Aranyaka III 1 3 In the latter part *bruvanam* and *para* and *upataded* for  
*bruvan param* and *opavudāḥ* seem essential giving the reasonable sense "if one is rebuking one  
 who says the *nirbhujas* the one (the latter) should say "Thou hast fallen from the two  
 lower (*antra*) places." So in the case of the *prairnnam* the two upper places are referred to  
 but in the case of the *ubhayaṃantareṇa* rebuke is impossible and no reply is suggested. It  
 would really be more natural to put the words of the apodosis in the mouth of the rebuker  
 but besides the difficulty of *atara* and *ullara* it is hardly possible that the section should give  
 directions for turning persons who recite

Aha khalo akur nirbhujatākīrah i pravam evaksaram pīrtarupam ullaram  
 ullararupam jakaratākarav<sup>1</sup> antareṇa sa samhiteḥ i sa ja evam etam samhītam  
 veda samdhyāle prajāya pāṇbhīr jasata brahmanavarcaṣma svargena lokena sarvām  
 aṇur etī || 11 ||<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> kara n B pr m For the opposite case of XIII 1 a 5 <sup>2</sup> 12 A B See Aitareya  
 Aranyaka III 1, 5

Aha etī tīyam brūmo nirbhujatākīrah sma itī ha smaha Hratvo āśand kējāḥ i  
 p rām evaksaram purvarupam ullaram ullararupam tad jasoṃ matra purarū  
 pollararūpe antareṇa yena samdhim tīratīyate yena matramatram tībhajāt yena  
 taratī<sup>1</sup> tarām tīyapajāt sa samhiteḥ i sa ja evam etam samhītim tēdā sam  
 dhyāle prajāya pāṇbhīr jasata brahmanavarcaṣma svargena lokena sarvām aṇur  
 etī || 12 ||<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So A, B clearly The Aitareya has *taratīyām* <sup>2</sup> 13 A B See Aitareya Aranyaka III 1 5

Aha ha smasya pūra aha madhyamah Pratyodhūpūro<sup>1</sup> āśandānvaḥ i pur am  
 evaksaram purvarupam ullaram ullararupam tad jasoṃ matra samdhyāpajāt  
 sama tad bhavati samavaham samhītam manya<sup>2</sup> itī i tad etad vabdhyaḍitum i mā  
 na tiencōhyo je abhi druhās padē i nīramino rīpato nnesu jagrduḥ i a āvānam ohaṭe  
 11 trayo hrīdī i Brhaspale<sup>3</sup> na paruk sat no tīdher itī ||<sup>4</sup> sa ja etam etīm samhītam



veda samdhyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena sarvam  
ayur eti || 13 ||<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pratyedhi<sup>o</sup> B pr m, Pratyedhi in Atareya <sup>2</sup> sarvata B <sup>3</sup> Brahspade B  
<sup>4</sup> =RV, II, 23, 16 <sup>5</sup> 14 A, B See Atareya Āranyaka, III, 1, 5

Vak pranena samdhyata ita Kauntharajah pranah patamanena pavamano  
vitar detar itive detah svargena lokena svargo loko brahmana satpatarapara  
samhita | ita ja etam etam ataraparam samhikam vedasam haiva ita prajāya  
pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena samdhyate jāśasāvarapara  
samhita | ita jadi porena vopastatāh svena taritēnabhi<sup>3</sup>dhared abhiyajāharann etā  
vidyad itam samhikagmad viduso detān abhiyajāharartham etam bhavijadity  
elenavaraparena itāha hanā tad bhavati || 14 ||<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> 15 A, B See Atareya Āranyaka, III, 1, 6

Itāta purtarupam pititararupam prajā samhitei Bhargatah | tad etad ekam  
eva<sup>1</sup> sarvam abhyānukiam | itāta ca hy etidam pita ca prajā ca sartaam | sataditi  
samhita<sup>2</sup> | aditir hy etidam sarvam jad idam kimcid vishvabhi<sup>3</sup>nam | tad etad vca<sup>4</sup>abhyu  
ditam | aditir dyaur aditir antarikiam | aditir māta sa pita sa putrah | vitive detā  
aditih paitā ja<sup>5</sup>nah | aditir jalam aditir jantvam it ||<sup>6</sup> sa ja etam etam samhikam  
veda samdhyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena sarvam  
ayur eti || 15 ||<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pava D pr m <sup>2</sup> "adit"<sup>o</sup> B <sup>3</sup> =RV I, 89, 10 <sup>4</sup> 16 A, B Cf Atareya  
Āranyaka, III, 1, 6

Jāya purvarupam pat r nitrarupam putrah samhita relah samdhik prajananam  
samdhanam it Sthavirah Sakasyah | sāsa Prajapatisamhita | ita ja etam etam  
samhikam veda prajāyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena lokena  
sartam ayur eti || 16 ||<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 17 A B See Atareya Āranyaka, III 1, 6, Vienna Or Journ, XVIII, 274

Prajā purvarupam braddhotitararupam karma samhita sahā samdhānam it  
Kahjopah | sāsā sahāsamhita<sup>1</sup> | tad ahur jat<sup>2</sup> sahāsamdhā deva it | ita ja etam  
etam samhikam veda samdhyate prajāya pasubhir jāśasa brahmatarccasena svargena  
lokena sartam ayur eti || 17 ||<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sahā<sup>o</sup> B pr m. The reference is not known to me. The epithet in Atharvaveda, VI,  
6 19, 10. <sup>2</sup> ja B <sup>3</sup> 18 A, B Not in Atareya Āranyaka.

Itā samhitei Paitālacandah | taca ita vedah<sup>1</sup> samdhyante<sup>2</sup> | taca chandam  
taca mitram samdadhat | tad jatratad aditir vā bhavati ita taci tadā prāno bhavati  
vā tadā prānam relhi<sup>3</sup> | itāha jat etapiti ita sumam va bhavati prāne tadā vag bhavati  
pranas tadā vacam relhi lav anyo 'nyam relhah | tad etad vca<sup>4</sup>abhyuditam | ekah  
suparnah ita samudram ā tiveda | ita idam ita am bhūvanam it caste | itam pakena

*brahṇa kāmaraṇḍi*<sup>1</sup> *kāmaraṇḍi bhṛtaḥ etam haṇḍa sa sarveṣu bhūtesu kāmaraṇḍi*  
*kāmaraṇḍi bhṛtaḥ ja etam tēda ja etam tēda* || 22 ||<sup>2</sup>

॥ *Iṣṭy Āraṇyake sapṛaṇḍo dhyāyāk* ॥

<sup>1</sup> So A B see in *lauṅḍiṇyāḥ* pr m, but cf. Weber *Catal*, II 3      <sup>2</sup> *haṇḍa* as B marg  
<sup>3</sup> = RV, 1, 125 2      <sup>4</sup> *anḍi* B      <sup>5</sup> *ruṇḍi* A corr in B But the mass of B may be a  
*constructio ad sensum*      <sup>6</sup> 23 A B Not in *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*

### ADHYĀYA VIII

Oni | *prano vamsa itī ha smaḥa Sthetirak Sakalyah* | *tad yatha śāstram*  
*sarve nṛjī tan śāh samahitah* | *yur etam etānasmā prane sarva atma samahitah* |  
*śayāśayātmānah* | *prajā upamaruṇam aśṇu sparṣarupam mayyanaḥ*<sup>1</sup> | *śatārupam*  
*mūṣam lūḥitam ity etac caśurīḥam akṣararūṇam itī* | *trajāṇa tv eva na elat*  
*proktam itī ha smaḥa Hraṇḍo Mandukyah* | *śayāśayā trajāya trinitah*<sup>2</sup> | *śaṣṭi*  
*sūṣam bhṛtanti samdhiṇam trinitat*<sup>3</sup> | *lani soṣṭavimśatisatani bhavanti sapṛaṇḍam*  
*sahisāni samvatsarasya horatranam tat samvatsarasya horatranṇy apnotī* | *sa eva*  
*samvatsaratasammānas cakṣurmajāḥ* | *śrotamajāḥ chandomajāḥ manomajāḥ tanmajā*  
*almā* | *sa ja etam etam samvatsaratasammānam cakṣurmajāṇam śrotamajāṇam chando-*  
*majāṇam manomajāṇam tanmajāṇam*<sup>4</sup> | *almanam tēda samvatsarasya śayāśayam śalokātam*  
*sarīratam sabhoktātam aṇṇute putrī pasuman bhṛtati sarvāṇa aṣṭy aṣṭy*  
*runikṛtya tēdāṇam cakre* || 23 ||<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *ḥ* om B      <sup>2</sup> *śr* *śitas* B      <sup>3</sup> *tā* *majā* B corrected into *manomajā*      <sup>4</sup> See  
*Āitareya Āraṇyaka* III 2 1

*Attha Āraṇyakeṇ* | *trini satṛisāṇy akṣaranam trini satṛisāṇy upmanam*<sup>1</sup>  
*trini satṛisāṇi samdhiṇam* | *janāṇy akṣarāṇy avocamahāni lani jan*<sup>2</sup> | *usmano rātriyas*<sup>3</sup>  
*ta*<sup>4</sup> | *jan samdhiṇ avocamahātrānam itī samdhayah* | *ity adhidānātam* | *attha*  
*dhyātmam* | *janāṇy akṣarāṇy adhidānātam avocamatīṇi lāny adhyātmam* | *jan*<sup>5</sup>  
*usmano dhidānātam avocama māyā as itī dhyātmam* | *eva u ha vai sampratīprano*  
*jan mayyāśad reṇa na* | *ta rī*<sup>6</sup> | *pranad relataḥ siddhir aṣṭi jad* | *ta rī*<sup>7</sup> | *pranad relataḥ*  
*trītye tat prīṇa na samdhātī* | *jan samdhiṇ adhidānātam avocama partāni lāny*  
*adhyātmam* | *śayāśayāśṭīyam*<sup>8</sup> | *māyāṇam partānam itī pañcelat cakṣurimśacchāṇam*  
*bhṛtanti samdhī nam pañcelat tad alitisahāṣram bhṛtaty alitisahāṣram tarkatiro*<sup>9</sup>  
*brhātir aḥar aḥani sampadaṇāni* | *sa eva hahsammanat cakṣurmajāḥ* | *śrotamajāḥ*  
*chandomajāḥ manomajāḥ tanmajāḥ alma* | *sa ja etam etad abahsammanam cakṣur-*  
*majāṇam śrotamajāṇam chandomajāṇam manomajāṇam tanmajāṇam almanam tēdāṇam śayāśayam*  
*śalokātam sarvapatam sabhaktātam aṇṇute putrī pasuman bhṛtati sarvāṇa aṣṭy aṣṭy* || 24 ||<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *us* *no* m B pr m      <sup>2</sup> *janāṇy* *us* *an* *no* B pr m      <sup>3</sup> *rātriyas* B corr      <sup>4</sup> *ta* m B pr m  
<sup>5</sup> *janāṇy* m B pr m      <sup>6</sup> *rī* *tel* B      <sup>7</sup> Read probably *śayāśayā* [*śayāśay*] - *śīḥnam* &c. as in  
*Āitareya Āraṇyaka* III 2 2      <sup>8</sup> *śīḥśāṇa* B pr m, corr to *śīḥśāṇa* is which is clearly =  
*śīḥśāṇa* no for *śīḥśāṇa* as in *Āitareya Āraṇyaka* III 2 2 Weber *Catal* II 6 takes it  
as a proper name The fo m is unique      <sup>9</sup> Om B pr m      <sup>10</sup> See *Āitareya Āraṇyaka* III 2 2

*Catādrah purusa it Vatsyah* i *surarapurusaś chandopuruso vedapuruso mahapurusa it* i *sarirapurusa it jam avocāma ja evāyam dāhika asma* i *lasyaisasya* 30 'yam asarirah prajñātma<sup>2</sup> sa rasah i *chandaḥpurusa it jam avocāma jena vedanveda Rgvedam Yajurvedam Sāmavedam it* i *lasyaisasya brahma rasas tasmad brahmistham brahmanam ityāyam kurtiśa* 30 *jajñāsyobhānam*<sup>3</sup> 21<sup>2</sup> 21<sup>2</sup> i *mahapurusa it jam avocāma sampāsara eva* i *lasyaisasyasau*<sup>4</sup> *aditṛo rasah* i *sa jat evāyam asarirah prajñātma jat cāsav aditṛa ekam etad it* 21<sup>2</sup> 21<sup>2</sup> i *tad etad vabhyu dītam* 11 3 11<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> asariraprajñātma B  
Aranyaka, III, 2, 3

<sup>2</sup> ośobām (?) B pr m

<sup>3</sup> ay om. B.

<sup>4</sup> See Aitareya

*Citram deśanam ud agad anikam* i *cakṣur Mūṛṇya Varuṇayogneh* i *apra dyutāpripitṛ antarikṣam* i *surya asma jagatas lashtuś ceti* 11<sup>1</sup> *etam evānūtidham tamhitam samādhyamanam manya*<sup>2</sup> *it ha imaha Vatsyah* i *etam a haṛa bāhvrā mahad<sup>3</sup>uktih mimamsata etam agnir aditṛyava etam mahurāte chandoga etam aśyam etam antarikṣa etam deśy etam agnāv etam rajāv etam candramāsy etam nakṣatrev etam aśv etam ośadhiv etam sarveṣu bhūteṣu etam akṣareṣu eva*<sup>4</sup> *brahmety upāsate* i *tad etad vabhyudītam* 11 4 11<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> = RV, I 115 : <sup>2</sup> manyate A B <sup>3</sup> maha only B. The *dukte* are supplied from A<sub>1</sub> and Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 3 and are added in B in marg <sup>4</sup> etam B sec. m

<sup>5</sup> See Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 3

*Ud tasyam kamasas pari* i *yohs fazjanā ullaram* i *decam deśaira suryam* i *aganma yohr ullamam it* 11<sup>1</sup> *sa eva kṣarasammānaś cakṣurmajāś itrotramajāś chandomajō manomajō tanmajāś asma* i *sa ja evam etam akṣarasammānam cakṣurmajam*<sup>2</sup> *itrotramajam chandomajam manomajam tanmajam almanam parasmai kamasat dugdhadoha*<sup>3</sup> *aśya vedz bhavaty abhago taci bhavaty abhago nukte*<sup>4</sup> i *tad etad vabhyudītam* 11 5 11<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> = RV, I 50 10 <sup>2</sup> it B pr m <sup>3</sup> dugdhā B <sup>4</sup> nukte B pr m nukte i B sec. m. nukte must be right B has "bhago" <sup>5</sup> See Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 3, 4

*Yas tityāja saccidam sakhayam* i *na tasya vasy apt bhago aśi* i *jad im itnoty alaham itnoti*<sup>1</sup> i *na hi pra. eīa sudṛṣṭya pantham it* 11<sup>2</sup> *naśyānukte taci bhago aśitṛy eva tad aha* i *tan na*<sup>3</sup> *parasma etid ahaḥ samten magnum cinnyān na mahatrakva stuyun naktid ulmāno pr āśya*<sup>4</sup> *it i na yev cāyam asarirah prajñātma jat cāsav aditṛa ekam etad it* 21<sup>2</sup> *avocāma hu jātra tṛpradrṣṭe* 11 6 11<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> itnoti B. <sup>2</sup> = RV, X, 71, 6 <sup>3</sup> nak B. <sup>4</sup> āśya B. <sup>5</sup> See Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 4.

*Candramā vraditṛo drṣṭy ite na rakṣmayah pradurbhāvanā loham dyaṛ bhavati jātha māṇṣtha tṛjastak payar bhavati sampareto nātma na citam na jicṛyāśit*<sup>1</sup> *itṛyāś i sa jat karanyam manyeta tat kuryāś i athāśy adarśe vedāke va jihmāsurasam*

vāṭirasam tatmānam paśyen na tū paśyet<sup>1</sup> tad apy etam eva vidyāt<sup>2</sup> | athāpi chidra<sup>3</sup>  
 chāya bhataṭi na tū bhavati tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpi chidra vādityo  
 rathanaḥbhūṭa vāḥhāyeta<sup>4</sup> tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpi nila nagnir dr̥ṣyeta<sup>5</sup>  
 jalhā mayuragrīva mahāmeghe tū marīcar na paśyed anābhre vā vidyutam paśyet  
 abhira enām na paśyet tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpy apidhāyāḥkṛmī upakṣeta  
 jatrataḥ taralākāṇṇa na paśyet tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpy<sup>6</sup> apidhāya  
 larnā upāsita ja eso 'gner eva jalalāḥ śabdo rathasya eva pādau tam na<sup>7</sup> jada  
 śruṅgāt tad apy etam eva vidyāt | athāpi vāparjasye kanimike dr̥ṣyete dvijāṇme<sup>8</sup> vā  
 na tū dr̥ṣyete tad apy etam eva vidyāt | sa ja 'to 'śruto 'mato 'upāśato 'dr̥ṣto 'nādis̥to  
 'ghuṣṭaḥ śrōta manū upāśata dr̥ṣṭadeṣṭā ghoṣṭi<sup>9</sup> | sari eṣām bhūkṣānām anīlara<sup>10</sup> puruṣaḥ  
 sa ma dīmeti vidyāt | sa ulkrāmann etasam aśarīram prajātmānam abhitarapadyate  
 vijahatīram dāhikam | sauṣṭa sarīrajai taca upanīpat sarva hantemah sarvajai  
 vāca upanīpada unam tv etam<sup>11</sup> acakṣate || 7 ||<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> paśyati B    <sup>2</sup> paśyetad B    <sup>3</sup> āpyat B pr m, text sec m, A, vs B    <sup>4</sup> dr̥ṣyate B.  
<sup>5</sup> ita B clearly, cf XI, 3 n 2    <sup>6</sup> Here in the MS = now page, f 65, has taken the place  
 of the original leaf of the MS. It is, however, in an old hand.    <sup>7</sup> talra B, but no is  
 implied in the abbreviated version of XI, 3 below, and inserted in Aitareya Āranyaka, III,  
 2, 4    <sup>8</sup> jātiv A    <sup>9</sup> roḥ A    <sup>10</sup> sry add A    <sup>11</sup> Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 4, 5.

Prthivyā rūpam sparśa anīlaksasojomāno divaḥ svarāḥ | Agne rūpam sparśa  
 Vayor āsmāna Adityaya svarāḥ | Rgvedaya rūpam sparśa Yajurvedasojomānaḥ  
 Samavedaya svarāḥ | rathantaraya rūpam sparśa Vāmadedasojomāno brhataḥ  
 svarāḥ | pranaya rūpam sparśa apanasojomāno vjanaya svarāḥ | pranaya  
 rūpam sparśa apanasojomāno manasaḥ svarāḥ | prānaya rūpam sparśa apanay-  
 somāno udanaya svarāḥ svarā ite Purnardaitaḥ | eva n hanta sarvām vācam  
 tida ja evam veda || 8 ||<sup>13</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'deva' B.

<sup>2</sup> See Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 5.

Attha khalv etam dantī tīnā bhavati tadā'aukṣṭir asau manur vīṇā bhavati |  
 tad jātheyam śatīratasi tardmatavasi bhavaty evam evāsau śatīratasi tardmatavasi  
 bhavati | tad jāthasyaḥ śra evam amuṣyaḥ śīṣaḥ | tad jāthasyai tamśa evam  
 amuṣyā dandah | tad jāthasyā udaram etam amuṣya ambhāṇim | tad jāthasyai  
 mukhanāṇīke akṣimī ity<sup>1</sup> evam amuṣyaḥ chidrām | tad jāthasyā angulinigrahā  
 upasīlaranāmīty evam amuṣyāḥ parvam<sup>2</sup> | tad jāthasya aṅgulya evam amuṣyā  
 śantīrajāḥ | tad jāthasyai jīhvanam amuṣyā vādanam | tad jāthasyāḥ para evam  
 amuṣyāḥ svarāḥ | tad jāthā hanteyam romaṣeṇa carmanāpīṣitū bhavaty etam  
 evāsau romaṣeṇa carmanāpīṣitū bhavati | romaṣeṇa ha ima carmanā purā vīṇā  
 apīdadhati | saiva danī vīṇā bhavati | sa ja evam etam dantīm tīnām veda  
 śrutatada' atamo<sup>3</sup> bhavati bhūmiprasja<sup>4</sup> kīrtir bha' it<sup>5</sup> suśrūṣunte<sup>6</sup> hāya parṣatsu

dhātyaanāṃśasjedam astu yad ayaṃ ihate jatrūryā vāg vadatī<sup>1</sup> vidur enam  
tatru ॥ 9 ॥<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> From f 66 on the old hand resumes

<sup>2</sup> abhīṣṭy B sec m.

<sup>3</sup> aarāṇa A.

<sup>4</sup> padmanāṃśa B. <sup>5</sup> dhātva<sup>6</sup> A, B. <sup>7</sup> dhātī B pr. m. <sup>8</sup> mātva<sup>9</sup> B. <sup>10</sup> vadatī B. tācāṃ  
may be read, but see Śatapatha Brahmana, III, 2, 3, 15. <sup>11</sup> See Antareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 5.

Athāta Tāndavindasya<sup>1</sup> vacaḥ | tad jatheyam akulaena vadayitrā vīṇā-  
rabdhā na kṛtām vīṇārtham sādhaaty evam evakulena vaktṛā vāg ārabdhā  
na kṛtām vāgartham sādhaaty | tad yathā harveyam kulāena vadayitrā vīṇā-  
rabdhā kṛtām vīṇārtham sādhaaty evam eva kulāena vaktṛā vāg ārabdhā kṛtām  
vāgartham sādhaaty | tasyai vā etasya vīṇāyā jā jvīṣṭā sā samhitā Kālyāṇapūtro  
Jālukarṇyāḥ | atha ha smatāt Kṛtāhārīto<sup>2</sup> brāhmaṇam evodāharat ॥ 10 ॥<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> vāndavasya B pr. m.

<sup>2</sup> So A, B, and Weber, Catal, II, 6. ॥ is very probably an

error for Kṛtā<sup>4</sup>, Antareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6. <sup>5</sup> See Antareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6.

Prajāpatih prajāḥ sṛtvā vyasramata sa chandobhir ātmānam samadadhat<sup>1</sup> |  
tad yac chandobhir ātmānam samadadhat<sup>2</sup> tasmāt saṃhitā | tasyai vā etasyai  
saṃhitāyāi ṇakūro balam ṇakūrah prāṇa ātmā saṃhitā | yaiśā<sup>3</sup> ksudramitrā vikṛti  
tānti nakhāni<sup>4</sup> romaṇṇ vyāṇjandanti | su yo 'tra vicikitsat saṇakāram eva brūyād ṛte  
ṇakāram itī saṇakāram eva brūyāt | etam eva jo 'tra vicikitsat saṇakāram eva brūyād  
ṛte saṇakāram<sup>5</sup> itī saṇakāram eva brūyāt | tau vā etau ṇakārasaṇakārau vidvān anusam-  
hitam pco 'dhīyīṣṭaṇṇyam itī vidyāt | evam eva vidyāt | atha vāg itihāsapurāṇam<sup>6</sup>  
yac cānyai himcā brāhmī kṛtyevādhyāte tad apy evam eva vidyāt | te yad vāyam  
anusatamhitam pco dhīmahe yac ca āsāndukēyāyā adhyāyam prabrūmas tena no  
ṇakārasaṇakārā upāptāu itī ha smāha Hrasvo āsāndukēyah | atha yad vāyam anu-  
saṇhitam pco 'dhīmahe yac ca evādhyāyam adhyāmahe tena no ṇakārasaṇakārā upāptāu  
itī ha smāha Sthavirāḥ Śākojyah | etad<sup>7</sup> ha sma vai tad vidvāmsa āhuh Kāvaṇyāḥ<sup>8</sup>  
himarīthā vāyam yokyāmahe<sup>9</sup> kemarīthā vāyam adhyāyamahe vācī hī prānam  
juhāmāḥ prāṇe vācam yo hy eva prabhavaḥ sa evāpyaya itī | tā etāḥ saṃhitā  
nānantevāsine brūyān nāsamvatsaravāsine<sup>10</sup> nābrahmocāriṇe nāvedavide nāpavaktra  
stī ācūryā itī ācūryāḥ ॥ 11 ॥<sup>11</sup>

॥ Ity Āranyake 'stamo 'dhyāyah ॥

<sup>1</sup> So A, B

<sup>2</sup> offhand A

<sup>3</sup> nakaram A, B

<sup>4</sup> āvāsa<sup>5</sup> B Both the MSS. have

brahmī Read perhaps brahmī kṛty evādhyāte <sup>6</sup> ta add B sec m. <sup>7</sup> āvāsa<sup>8</sup> B sec m.

<sup>9</sup> kṛtyāmahe B pr m, and for apyayāḥ below, apyayāḥ. <sup>10</sup> m add B pr m. <sup>11</sup> See Antareya  
Āranyaka, III, 2, 6

अध्यायः IX.

Om | tat Savitur vṛnāmahe | vāyam devasya dhyanam | śreṣṭhām sarvasāhātām |  
turam dhagasya dhimahi

tat Savitur varenyam | dhargo devasya dhimahi |

dhīyo<sup>1</sup> jo mah pracedayāt ॥

adabdhām manā usitam cakṣuḥ । suryo yojitum śreṣṭho dīkṣe mā mā hīn-  
sīh ॥ 1 ॥<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> dhīyo B see RV V 82 1 III 61 10

<sup>2</sup> Cf VII 1

Yo ha vai jyeṣṭham ca śreṣṭham ca tēda jyeṣṭhaś ca ha vai śreṣṭhaś ca stūnām  
bhātati prano vai jyeṣṭhaś ca śreṣṭhaś ca ॥ yo ha vai tasiṣṭhām tēda tasiṣṭho ha stānam  
bhātati tog vai tasiṣṭha ॥ 30 ॥ ha vai praśeṣṭham tēda praśe ha tisthaśy asmimś ca<sup>1</sup>  
loke mutimūś ca<sup>2</sup> cakṣur ha praśiṣṭha ॥ 30 ॥ ha vai sampadām tēda tam hasmai kamah  
sampadyante śreṣṭram ha ॥ ॥ ॥ sampat ॥ 30 ॥ ha tē aśalanam tēdajalano ha stānam  
bhātati mano va aśalanam । attha hemā detatah Priyapatim pitarām śyābhrān  
ho vai nāh<sup>3</sup> śreṣṭha ite । sa hotaca Prajupater jastim tva ukraṇte karirām papriṣṭham  
ita manjela sa vai śreṣṭha ite ॥ 31 ॥<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> prei ha sad asmim B      <sup>2</sup> ca add B sec m      <sup>3</sup> na B.      <sup>4</sup> I have kept this  
enumeration though I (like ॥ II 1) is merely a Śānti as it is followed in the MS. See Chāndogya  
Upaniṣad V 1 1-7 which has a parallel version with the better reading *praśe ha ti thati*

Sa ha tog uccakrama । jatho mukā azadantaś pranantiś prānena paśyantiś  
cakṣuśa śreṣṭhantiś śreṣṭrena dhīyanto manasantiām ite ॥ 3 ॥

Cakṣur hoccakrama jathandha apaśyantiś pranantiś pranena tadantiś taccā  
śreṣṭhantiś śreṣṭrena dhīyanto manasantiām ite ॥ 4 ॥

Śreṣṭram hoccakrama । jatho budhira śreṣṭhantiś pranantiś pranena tadantiś  
taccā paśyantiś cakṣuśa dhīyanto manasantiām ite ॥ 5 ॥

Mano hoccakrama । jathiḥ bālā amanasaś pranantiś pranena tadantiś taccā  
paśyantiś cakṣuśa śreṣṭhantiś śreṣṭrenantiām ite ॥ 6 ॥

Prano hoccakrama । jatho tad jatho tad saundhataś sukṛjāṇṇ padbhāfāmkṛ  
samahhided etam aśm prānam samahhided<sup>1</sup> । te ha samejocur<sup>2</sup> bhāgaton mokramir  
ite । sa hotaca pranoś kim ma<sup>3</sup> annam bhāsiṣṭaś ite । jat kimcaś itṭhya pāśaku  
niṭhya ite । kim me taso bhāsiṣṭaśy opa ite hocuḥ । tasm ad tva aśm aśiṣan<sup>4</sup>  
purasīac coparīśīac cadbhīś paridadhāte । lamdhuko<sup>5</sup> hatya taso bhāraty annaṇo hi  
bhavati । tad ha smantat Sahajan<sup>6</sup> Jabalo Golruta<sup>7</sup> tanyoghropadājokti naca ।  
apy etam iṣṭakāya sīhanoh prabṛi jay jayaram aśya śakṭhaś<sup>8</sup> praroheṣyuh palāṇanti ।  
tānarpate tatat aśe turohela dīyam ma līar antarekṣam ma ma kumir ite ha Tjṛha  
vaikyaś<sup>9</sup> ॥ 7 ॥

<sup>1</sup> I om ॥ sec m Above it has *annaṇṇ*      <sup>2</sup> i om ॥      <sup>3</sup> kima and no *at* B  
<sup>4</sup> aśiṣya B and *pari dadhate* as in Chāndogya Upaniṣad V 2 2      <sup>5</sup> lamdhuko B pr m  
*lamdhuko* ॥ sec m *annaṇṇ* B For a similar error (as for *e*) cf I 8 n 4 ॥ 3 n 1  
These are due to the older mode of denoting the diphthongs      <sup>6</sup> ca (f) add B.      <sup>7</sup> In  
Chāndogya Upaniṣad, ॥ 2 2 sq which is parallel to this passage there ॥ *Colrutoye* which  
may well be read here.      <sup>8</sup> *śiṣṭhā* ap B pr m *śakṭhā* B sec m      <sup>9</sup> See ॥ *ājananeyi*  
Sāṃhitā (which is here cited in terms) V 43 where for *te* is *lebhīr* 1 and *le* interchange  
pass in MS and I prefer *le* r ( $\sqrt{h} = \sqrt{r}$ ) Also *ma* is only once used in *antarī* om &c.  
Probably it is here a d itograph

*Atha yadī mahaj<sup>1</sup> jagamiset tirutram dilutva<sup>2</sup> ma. ājyāyām sartausadaya mantham dadhimadhuḥhāyām upamanthyaḥgnim upasamadha<sup>3</sup> a parisamuhya paristiry<sup>4</sup> a parjuktaya daksanam jano aṣṭottarale<sup>5</sup> gneḥ kamse mantham kṛita hutva homan manthe sampalam anayet | jyesthāya śreṣṭhāya svāhety agnau hutva manthe<sup>3</sup> sampalam anayet | prastishayay svāhety agnau hutvā manthe sampalam anayet | sampade svāhety agnau hutva manthe sampalam anayet | tat Savitur tarenṇyam itī poechoḥ praty<sup>6</sup> a tat Savitur virmaha itī pachea acūmati mahajyāhṛitohit caturtham nurniyya<sup>4</sup> kamṣyam carmanā vā sṭhandile vā samvidate | sa yadī śtriyam pāhyet samrddham harmeti vudyāt samrddham harmeti vudyāt || 8 ||*

|| Ity Aranyake navamo 'dhyāyah ||

<sup>1</sup> yadī mahamiset B pr m, text marg      <sup>2</sup> dilutva B      <sup>3</sup> mantham B A has *gyar* *tṛyaye* *irasthaye*      <sup>4</sup> nurniyya B possibly an error (cf XI, 3, n 1) for *nirnyya*, an irregular strong gerund (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 991 b) The parallel, Chandogya, V, 2, 8, has *nirnyya* The words *mahajyāhṛitohit caturtham* ('m B) no doubt mean 'accompanying the fourth act with the three words *āhur bhūvas soar*', as would be needed in the case of the first RV verse, which has only three Padas

#### ADHYĀYA X.

*Om | athato 'dhyatmikaṁ āntaram agnihotrām ity ācātsate | etā ha vai devatāḥ purnā mā prastishṭvā agnir iate iayub prana adityaḥ cakṣus<sup>1</sup> candrāma manasā dīpāḥ śrotra apo relas | itān ha vai sarvasu hūlam bhavati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī ca pibati ca tṛpyati sa tarpajati || 1 ||*

<sup>1</sup> cakṣus B

*So tṛpīo vasam tarpayati vak tṛplagnim tarpayaty agniḥ tṛplāḥ pṛthivim tarpayati pṛthivī tṛplā yat kmcid pṛthivyapikulam | bhavad bhaviyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī ca pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati || 2 ||*

*So tṛplāḥ prānam tarpayati prānas tṛplō nāyam tarpayati nāyas tṛplā nāśam tarpayaty akāśas tṛplō yat kamcakakemapekṣitam | bhavad bhaviyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī ca pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati || 3 ||*

*So tṛplās cakṣus tarpayati cakṣus tṛplām adityam tarpayaty adityas tṛplō divam tarpayati dyaus tṛplā yat kmcid divāpikṣitam | bhavad bhaviyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvān ātmā ca pibati caśayati ca payajati ca | so śnātī sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati || 4 ||*

*So tṛplō manas tarpayati manas tṛplām candramasam tarpayati candramas tṛplō nakṣatram tarpayati nakṣatram tṛplām māsam tarpayanti masas tṛplā ardhamaśvatas tarpayanti ardhamaśvas tṛpl | ahoratre tarpayanti ahoratre tṛplē rāmas*

tarpayati<sup>1</sup> vītas tṛptāḥ samvatsaram tarpayanti savatsaras tṛpto jaḥ kimeś  
samtatsarenopihitam | bhātad bhavīyad bhūtam tat sarvām tarpayati ja etam vidvan aśnati ca pibati caśayati  
ca payayati ca | so 'śnati sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati || 5 ||

<sup>1</sup> tarpayati B.

Sa tṛptāḥ śrotram tarpayati śrotram tṛptam diśas tarpayati diśas tṛpta avantara  
diśas tarpayanti avantaradiśas tṛpta jaḥ kimeśavantaradigbhir opihitam | bhātad  
bhavīyad bhūtam tat sarvām tarpayati ja etam vidvan aśnati ca pibati caśayati  
ca payayati ca | so 'śnati sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati || 6 ||

Sa tṛpto relas tarpayati relas tṛptam apas tarpayaty apas tṛpta nādīms tarpa  
yanti nadyaḥ tṛptāḥ samudram tarpayanti samudro tṛpto jaḥ kimeś samudrenāpi  
hitam | bhātad bhavīyad bhūtam tat sarvām tarpayati ja etam vidvan aśnati ca  
pibati caśayati ca payayati ca | so 'śnati sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati || 7 ||

Sa tṛptas tad itad vairajam daśavidham agnīhotram bhavati | tasya prāna  
evahataniyo paṇo garhapaṇo vyāṇo pūṣharyapacāno mano dhūmo manyur arcir  
danta angarāḥ śradhā pāyo rakṣasāḥ saḥyam aśvīḥ prajñātma sa rasah<sup>1</sup> |  
tad etad vairajam daśavidham agnīhotram hūtam bhavati | roṣoḥjyam roṣoḥjyam  
adhyarūḥam<sup>2</sup> abhī svargam lokam gomayati ja etam vidvan aśnati ca pibati  
caśayati ca payayati ca | eīha ja idam avidvan agnīhotram juhoti jathangaran<sup>3</sup>  
apohya bhāsmāni hūtam tadṛk tatṛk tadṛk tat tṛat<sup>4</sup> || 8 ||

|| Ity Aranyake daśamo dhyaḥ ||

<sup>1</sup> prajñāni aḥ B. sa om A.

<sup>2</sup> So A. <sup>3</sup> rūḥam B.

<sup>4</sup> yatḥ ang<sup>2</sup> B.

<sup>1</sup> tadṛk tasya tadṛk tasyat B.

<sup>2</sup> For X 2 8 cf Chāndogya Upaniṣad V 19-24

## ADHYAYA XI

Prajapatis va imam puruṣam udatīcat<sup>1</sup> | tasmim ekā devatā aveśyad vācy  
agnim prane tasyam apāne vidyuta udāne parjanyaṁ cakṣusy adhiṣṭam manasi  
candramasam śrotri diśāḥ sarire pṛthivīm relasy apo bala indram manyav iśanam  
|| rāṇy aśvām atmani brahma | sa jatha mahān amṛtakumbhah<sup>2</sup> pīṇamānas  
tūṣhīd evam haviṣa sa tūṣṭhau | atha hema devatā ityam cakṛire him aḥ am aśmadhiḥ  
puruṣah<sup>3</sup> karisyati him va tasyam<sup>4</sup> anena | hanīsmāc ckarirad utkrāmameḥ |  
ta hockakramuḥ | atha hedam śarīram vīkīam va parīśuvīram<sup>5</sup> | ta hekīam cakṛe  
Prajapatiḥ vandhrya na ksamam<sup>6</sup> hanīham ima aśanayapīpasādhyaṁ uparjy<sup>7</sup>  
ih | ta hōparasye<sup>8</sup> | ta hōpar tah<sup>9</sup> sukham alābhamānu imam eva puruṣam pūnah  
pratyavīśuḥ || 1 ||

<sup>1</sup> adātīcat A. B. and cf Weber Catal., II 6 text Cowell's MS B.

<sup>2</sup> amṛtah B.

a common error e.g. XI 4 n 2. The reference is to the swelling of the soma.

<sup>3</sup> him

ins. B pr m. <sup>4</sup> manyam B pr m. corr marg.

<sup>5</sup> So B from √hr and affix ira (cf

Whitney Sanskrit Grammar § 2183 c).

<sup>6</sup> mah am A. B. I take śarīram as the subject.

na śaksam (n for ś) is at it eas er to conjecture but is less plausible.

<sup>7</sup> apo rje B. For

the perf. cf Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I 3 21. XI 4 2.

<sup>8</sup> rje B.



Vāṁ mamety aṅgīr avitṛṣa | prano mameti rajar avitṛṣa | apāno mameti vidyuta<sup>1</sup>  
 avitṛṣuḥ | udāno mameti parjanya āvitṛṣa | cakṣur mamety aditya avitṛṣa | mano  
 mameti candraṁ avitṛṣa | śrotram asmakam ite diśa ajivīṣuḥ | śarīram mameti  
 prithivy avitṛṣa | rito 'smakam ity apa avitṛṣuḥ | bālam mameśandra avitṛṣa | manjur  
 mameśana avitṛṣa | mūrḍha mamety akāśa avitṛṣa | ātmā mameti brāhmaṇitṛṣa |  
 sa jathā mahān vrkṣa urdra upasiṣṭamulāś īśīṣed evam haviṣa sa īśīḥ ॥ 2 ॥

<sup>1</sup> vidyuta B van<sup>o</sup> A (as in XI, 1), but avitṛṣa The verb is clearly wrong of XI §

Athāyam parusaḥ pratyān<sup>1</sup> parā samvatsaraś samvatsaraḥ a dr̥ṣiṣṭi paśyati |  
 chidrā chāya bhavati na ca bhavati | mahameghe va maricir eva paśyed anobhre  
 vidyutam paśyed obhira enam na paśyati | ātmā va apidhaya varasakani<sup>2</sup> va na  
 paśyati | karnau vapidhayaopaddam eva na īrṇeti | natmi loka ramate natnam  
 manāś chandayati<sup>3</sup> | ite prajāyadarśanani ॥ 3 ॥

<sup>1</sup> prastāyan B read perhaps the usual preyon of Wachsmagel *Altindische Grammatik*,  
 I, 320 321 and IX 8, n 4 A has vidyutak below <sup>2</sup> daruṣam B, see VIII 7, n 5,  
 which passage is parallel <sup>3</sup> chandayati B

Atha śarpnāḥ | puruṣam kṛṣnam kṛṣnadantam paśyati sa enam hanṁ varaha  
 enam hanṁ marikata enam hanṁ bṛāṇi khādyaśi śaṣarnam bhukṣayitva<sup>1</sup> vagiraty  
 ekapaundarikam<sup>2</sup> dharayati gam savatṣam dakṣinamukhe nalaḍamaśi vṛjayaśi | sa  
 ja eteṣam kimeśi<sup>3</sup> paśyati panduradarśanam kalim<sup>4</sup> śrīyam muktaketam mundam  
 śailādhyangab<sup>5</sup> | kausamōbhāpīrtidhamam gilany upararohanam dakṣinātagamanadīni<sup>6</sup>  
 tiskṛjopāya payatam śthāpikam śrapayitva sarupavotsaya goḥ payasi na tv eva  
 tu kṛṣṇaḥ aḥni upasamadhaya parusamukhya paritirya paryuktya dakṣinam  
 janu aya śruvenajyahulir juhoṣi ॥ 4 ॥<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> bhukṣayitva B corr to vāg in bhukṣay<sup>2</sup> <sup>2</sup> ekāś A B <sup>3</sup> kṣay at corr in B but see  
 A tateya Āṇyaka III 2 4 <sup>4</sup> kaṣam B <sup>5</sup> śāyangaś A B Or śailādhyangab<sup>6</sup>  
 may be read <sup>6</sup> Text doubtful B has dakṣinātagamanadīni the intermediate letters are  
 obscure and have been corrected in a later hand A has 'aśa' <sup>7</sup> See VIII 7

Vaci me gñiḥ pratisthitaś svaha | prane me vajuh pratisthitaś svaha | apāne  
 me vidyuh<sup>1</sup> pratisthitaś svaha | udane me parjanyaḥ pratisthitaś svaha | cakṣuḥ  
 me adityaḥ pratisthitaś svaha | manas me candraṁ pratisthitaś svaha | śrotre  
 me diśaḥ pratisthitaś svaha | śarīre me prithivī pratisthitaś svaha | rito ma apaḥ  
 pratisthitaś svaha | bāle ma indraḥ pratisthitaś svaha | manjau ma śānaḥ pra-  
 tisthitaś svaha | mūrḍham ma akāśaḥ pratisthitaś svaha | ātmā me brāhma  
 pratisthitaś svaheti | athaulad aṅgīrāśam śthāpikam samataniṁ<sup>2</sup> a<sup>3</sup> śthāpikayā  
 paghatam juhoṣi ॥ 5 ॥

<sup>1</sup> vidyuh<sup>2</sup> pratisthitaś A

<sup>2</sup> aya B The root is samatani

Vaci me gñiḥ pratisthitaś aḥni hrdaye hrdayam ātmāś tat saḥyam dīṇam

maham<sup>1</sup> akāmo marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī prane me tasyāḥ  
 pratisthito prano hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo  
 marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī apāne me vidhūśah pratisthito<sup>2</sup>  
 apāno hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marisyamy  
 annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī udane me parjanyak pratisthito udanam hrdaye  
 hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marisyamy annatan annado  
 bhūyasam sūahā ī cakṣuṣi ma adṛśah pratisthitaḥ cakṣur hrdaye hrdayam<sup>3</sup> ātmani  
 tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī  
 manasi me cāndramah pratisthito mano hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam  
 maham akāmo marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī jiretre me dīśah  
 pratisthita dīśo hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo  
 marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī śarīre me prithuḥ pratisthito prithuḥ  
 hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marisyamy annatan  
 annado bhūyasam sūahā ī bale ma indrah pratisthito balaḥ hrdaye hrdayam ātmani  
 tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī  
 manyau ma usanaḥ pratisthito manyuḥ hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam  
 maham akāmo marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī mūrdhani ma akāśah  
 pratisthito mūrdha hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo  
 marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī ātmani me brahma pratisthitaḥ  
 ātma hrdaye<sup>4</sup> hrdayam ātmani tat sahyam devanam maham akāmo marisyamy  
 annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī ātmanā ma ātmanā pratisthitaḥ ātmanā  
 samataniṣya juhōti ॥ 6 ॥

<sup>1</sup> So clearly A B    <sup>2</sup> var<sup>2</sup> A    <sup>3</sup> pratisthito A, B    <sup>4</sup> Henceforth the acc. be. of B abbreviates  
 to hrdaye hā    <sup>5</sup> Even here the abbreviation is meant

Ātmā jagatam aśas brahmadhām lōham ausmiham sisam kakūdhām rajatam  
 śatrayam sutarnam gajaratam annam tarayam<sup>1</sup> īrṣīr amuśubdhām naham  
 samrojjam Brhaspatir dardhaham Brahma panktam Prayapatir atichandasam Saviṣṭra  
 sartaśidaci andasena chandasah ॥ 7 ॥

<sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup> rojjam B.

Ātme a sūhro tāsami jagatena chandisa ī furuso manik pranaḥ sutram annam  
 granthiḥ tad granthine udgrathaniy<sup>1</sup> annakimih<sup>2</sup> ī mṛṣave brahmanim aśe sarram  
 īsur aśyagustman maham akāmo marisyamy annatan annado bhūyasam sūahā ī  
 aśa<sup>3</sup> ī a sūhro tāsami brahmadhena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ<sup>4</sup> sūahā ī lōham  
 ī a sūhro tāsami ausmihena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ sūahā ī sisam ī a sūhro  
 tāsami kakūdhena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ sūahā ī rajatam ī a sūhro tāsami  
 śatrayena chandasa furuso manik pranaḥ sūahā ī sutarnam ī a sūhro tāsami  
 gajaratena chandisa furuso manik pranaḥ sūahā ī annam ī a sūhro tāsami ī a sūhro

jena candama puruso manih pranah svāha | *īṣṭir* na sthiro vasani anusūbhena  
 chandasa puruso mamh pranah svāha | *nakam* na sthiro vasani samrojjena chandasa  
 puruso manih pranah svāha | *Brhaspatir* va sthiro vasani barhadena chandasa pu-  
 ruso manih pranah svāha | *Brahmeva* sthiro vasani panktina chandasa puruso + *īṣṭir*  
 pranah svāha | *Prajāpatir* va sthiro vasani atichandasena chandasa puruso manih  
 pranah svāha | *Savitṛ*<sup>1</sup> na sthiro vasani sarvatedachandasena chandasa puruso  
 manih pranah svāha | *prajāyati* va *jāyati*<sup>2</sup> *prajāya* vantevasine 'nyasmai vāpi  
*jayati* kamajeta tasma ucchisitam dadyaḥ | *sa* *hapi* *śalam* *variam* *jītaḥ* *punaḥ*  
*punaḥ* *prayujyano*<sup>3</sup> *jīvati* *am* *jīvati* *ete* || 8 ||

|| *Ity* *Āraṇyaka* *ekadāśo* 'adhyāyāḥ ||

<sup>1</sup> *udgratāṇany* B    <sup>2</sup> *da* B pr m, *domo* B sec m    <sup>3</sup> *ya* B sec m    <sup>4</sup> The  
 scribe abbreviates henceforth to *pr* *svāha* I have so printed to save space    <sup>5</sup> *savitrir*  
 B pr m, <sup>6</sup> *īṣṭir* B sec m, <sup>7</sup> *īṣṭva* A    Possibly *savitrir* *sva* with shortening may be meant (cf  
 Macdonell *Sanskrit Grammar*, p 63, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 321, 322)  
<sup>8</sup> *jayati* B pr m, *cor* m marg    <sup>9</sup> *prayujyano* B, is just possible

## ADHYĀYA XII

*Om* | *hashtavarasam* *prathitam* *brhadrajaḥ* |  
*yad* *Aditya*<sup>1</sup> *tanvaḥ* *sambodhiva* |  
*tan* *mahyam* *samoduh* *sarvam*<sup>2</sup> *ete* |  
*Adityaso* *Aditya*<sup>3</sup> *samvudanaḥ* || 1 ||

*yad* *te* *varco* *jataredaḥ* |  
*brhad* *bhavaty* *ahitam* |  
*tama* *na* *varcata* *ivam* |  
*Agne* *varcasvinam* *kuru* || 2 ||

*jac* *ca* *vaca* *va* *puruso* |  
*jac* *ca* *hashtya* *ahitam* |  
*svartne* *gotu* *yad* *varcaḥ* |  
*māy* *īd* *hashtavarasam* || 3 ||

*yad* *akṣem* *kuranyesu* |  
*gotu* *svartne* *śam*<sup>4</sup> *śam*<sup>5</sup> *ī* |  
*svartam* *puṣṭamanayam* |  
*māy* *īd* *hashtavarasam* || 4 ||

*māy* *bhargo* *māy* *māhāḥ* |  
*māy* *śam*<sup>6</sup> *śam*<sup>7</sup> *yad* *jātaḥ* |



augha na śūpān<sup>1</sup> pra nudat sapānān |  
 jahyāt sapānān śadākṣit vānā ॥ 11 ॥  
 am vṛica madhyāt pra<sup>2</sup> vṛicoparistat |  
 vi vṛica pāścat prati śūra vṛica |  
 tīgṛā prannīlan maghātann amitrān |  
 śūra<sup>3</sup> rasantam Maruto 'nu jantu ॥ 12 ॥  
 itam rudraṃ hṛtibhikṣā pānāmānah |  
 Indram manvānā Maruto juṣanta |  
 vṛparnaḥ kākāḥ pra mṛsantu enan |  
 mahiyātam dāmśtri vadhāntu ॥ 13 ॥  
 brahmanullāṣya maghāvan prīṇyātāḥ |  
 vīṣag<sup>4</sup> Indra bhāṅgāḥ pāśantu |  
 ma jñātaram aśata mā<sup>5</sup> pratisthām |  
 mītho vighnānā upa jñāntu mṛtyum ॥ 14 ॥  
 Agni jāśasvin jāśate sam arpaṣya |  
 Indravasim oparitam iha vaha |  
 aṣyam mardhā paramēthi sūtarcaḥ |  
 sajātānam uttamaśloko astu ॥ 15 ॥ ॥ 3 ॥

<sup>1</sup> The metre requires \*lena vṛica . . . <sup>2</sup> *lapot* B the word being no doubt misunderstood  
<sup>3</sup> *pra vi* A, B, but not only this is bad metre (in no case is the metre good, but an *vṛica* may  
 be read), but the *vi* following renders the double prefix most improbable <sup>4</sup> *amitrān* *churs* A  
 B, possibly for *sa vṛita(n)tam* <sup>5</sup> *vāśat* A B <sup>6</sup> So I read The verse is a mutilated version of  
 Atharvaveda, VI, 22, 3 (= VIII, 8, 21) *ma jñātaram ma pratisthām vandanta | mītho vighnānā  
 upa jñāntu mṛtyum* See also Śivalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 10, 11 *f A O S, XXVI 127*  
 B has *śāśamāḥ*, *pratisthāmāho vighnānān jāntu* A has *śāśo*, *vijñāntu* The text is merely  
 a conjecture <sup>7</sup> Cf Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 3<sup>4-5</sup>, ending *somavānānam uttamaśloko  
 astu* Either *sa jñat* or *ajñat* is possible, and *uttamaśloko* or *uttamāśloko*

bhādrām pāṣyanta upa sedur agan |  
 tāte dīkṣam vṛjyāḥ svaroidaḥ |  
 śatūḥ kṣātram bahum aṣat ca jutam |  
 tad aśmai dānu abhi sam namantam ॥ 16 ॥<sup>1</sup>  
 dhūta vidhūta paramota samdrk |  
 Prājapatēḥ paramēthi sūtarcaḥ |  
 śomavi chandamā mṛdo ma akūḥ |  
 śāśmai vāśtram abhi sām namantām ॥ 17 ॥<sup>2</sup>  
 abhy a vartadhvam upa sevāgnim |  
 aṣyam śastadhīpāt no astu |

atyā vyāṇam anu sam rabhadhām |  
imam paścād anu jīvatha satte || 18 ||<sup>2</sup>

alardo<sup>1</sup> nāma jato 'sī |  
pura sūryaś purosasah<sup>2</sup> |  
tam ita sapainakṛtyanam<sup>3</sup> |  
vedaiho<sup>4</sup> tistamobhayaṁbhānam || 19 ||

nardhe pramūṣṭa<sup>5</sup> sarā<sup>6</sup> d.isanām |  
kaipela vakyam prīṇaś saheta |  
pramūṣṭam tasya d.isanām ahuḥ |  
iramam bhāvam jo bōdharā || 20 || · || 4 ||

<sup>1</sup> Cf Taittiriya Saṁhitā, V, 7, 4 3, Taittiriya Āranyaka, III 11, 9 (with *pālyanta*, *agri*, and *tāḥ*), Atharvaveda, XIV, 41 1, and Whitney's translation, p. 963 Cf p 349 A, B have *agri* and *pālyanta* <sup>2</sup> Cf Taittiriya Saṁhitā, V, 7, 4 4 (with *śrīṣṭa* *śrīṣṭa*, and *addī* *śam* *śamāna*) A has *śamāna* <sup>3</sup> Cf *ibid.*, V, 7 4, 5, with *śa* *śa* *śa*, and *śa* (B has *śa*)

<sup>4</sup> So A, B. The word may be connected with *śrīṣṭa* or *śrīṣṭa* Atharvaveda, XV, 131, 8 Cp p 349 <sup>5</sup> = Atharvaveda, X, 7, 31<sup>6</sup> <sup>7</sup> *śa* *śa* *śa* *śa* B But *śa* *śa* *śa* is too like *śa* *śa* *śa* in MSS to render the reading doubtful <sup>8</sup> The metre is wrong and *śa* *śa* may belong to the line before, or *śa* be an interpolation. <sup>9</sup> *śa* *śa* B <sup>10</sup> *śa* B

na sa śaptam<sup>1</sup> aśnati na kīḍisam kṛiam |  
nainam dnyo Varuṇo hanis dhūtam |  
nainam kṛuddham manjato 'bhi janis<sup>2</sup> |  
iramam bhāvam jo bōdharā || 21 ||

nasya śvacam kimsaś<sup>3</sup> jātavedāḥ |  
na mamtam aśnati na hanis janis |  
śaśyur aśmīṇaś yavadaśisāś praita |  
iramam bhāvam jo bōdharā || 22 ||

nasya praja duṣṭaś jyatamaś |  
na śailago<sup>4</sup> bhataś na śaśakṛṇṇaś |  
manjan mīṭhaś tasya kuktis juyale |  
iramam bhāvam jo bōdharā || 23 ||

nasyāpavādāś na śraśāśakāś<sup>5</sup> grhe |  
na śaśakṛṇṇaś<sup>6</sup> na tūcāś śaśaś |  
nāśmīṇaś aśmīṇaś śaśaś nīcāśanam |  
iramam bhāvam jo bōdharā || 24 ||

nainam rakṣo na śaśaś śaśaś |  
na śaśakṛṇṇaś nīcāś aśmīṇaś na śaśaś |

na sūtika tasya grheṣu<sup>1</sup> jāyate ।

irāmanim baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 25 ॥ ॥ 5 ॥

<sup>1</sup> sam (?) *suplam* A, B    <sup>2</sup> *abhinavati*<sup>3</sup> A, B    <sup>4</sup> Probably *metra caṣṭa* (- o u after caesura)  
Cf ver 25<sup>4</sup>, 26<sup>4</sup>    <sup>5</sup> *śauleḥ* B pr m, *śauleḥ* A, B see m *abhinavati* is dissyllabic Cf Hopkins's  
*Ancient Epic of India*, II 260, and for a similar case in the Aitareya Brahmana, my note,  
*J R A S*, 1903, p 302    <sup>6</sup> *pravalaka* B If *pravalaka* is right, the *śa* must add nothing  
in the word,    <sup>7</sup> *śamapataḥ* B pr m, *śaṣṭa* sec. m A has *vaiśa*    <sup>8</sup> *śulastya* A

nainam vjaghro na trko na ātīpti ।

na śtāpadam himsati kamcanainam ।

na hasinam kruddham upaiti bhūtim<sup>4</sup> ।

irāmanim baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 26 ॥

nainam sarpo na prdukur hinasati ।

na tritiko na tīraścīnaraḥ<sup>1</sup> ।

natnam kṛśno<sup>2</sup> āir<sup>3</sup> abhi<sup>4</sup> samhale ।

irāmanim baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 27 ॥

natnam pramatam<sup>4</sup> Varuno hinasati ।

na maharo na grahaś śtīmarahat

paravarat chivam aśmas kṛhaś ।

irāmanim baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 28 ॥

pramīyukam aṣṭa dvisanam aśubh ।

purpam iva chinnam rāha bandhanena ।

angha iva śarṇam pra mudat sapānam ।

irāmanim baṣṭam 30 bīḍharta ॥ 29 ॥

ayam mamūḥ pratuaro jambū jṇaya bādhyati ।

anentdro Vṛtram aśann rama<sup>4</sup> ca manitima ॥ 30 ॥ ॥ 6 ॥

<sup>1</sup> *śīlām* A, B see m Cf *J A O S*, XXVIII, 390    <sup>2</sup> *tīraścīmaraja* B, °*cina*<sup>3</sup> A  
<sup>4</sup> *śā* only A, B The animal *kṛśno* is doubtful (*Aithyaaveda* XI 2, 2 is taken otherwise by  
Whitney in his translation), and the *kṛśno* *śā* is regular, hence I add *āir*    <sup>5</sup> °*pram* B, see  
*Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, II, 2, 1, 2    <sup>6</sup> *rama* B

śakendro dvivataś sahetstaraḥ<sup>1</sup> ।

śahasta prīṇayataś ।

naga iva purvopadaśhṛjām ।

abhi tūṣṭha<sup>2</sup> prīṇayataś ॥ 31 ॥

agad ayam baṣṭo mamūḥ ।

sapāna<sup>3</sup> kṣayano vṛsa ।

śam paśyanti kauśyāś sarvaśvataś ।

jūṣṭha sapānam samare śaśyuk<sup>4</sup> ॥ 32 ॥

amṛitam me manas sūtram Atvinav opī nahjalam ।  
 bahīhah sahasraśrīyo 'si ma le dharta risam<sup>1</sup> aham ॥ 33 ॥  
 ghṛtad ulluṣṭo<sup>2</sup> madhūman payasam ।  
 dhānamyajo dharuno dhavayisnuh ।  
 rujan sapānna<sup>3</sup> adharams ca kṛtān ।  
 ॥ roha mam mahale saubhagaya ॥ 34 ॥  
 Prajāpate na tvad ekiny anyah ।  
 viśva jānāṁ pari te baddhva ।  
 yajñamas te juhumat tan no astu ।  
 tanyam yajña palāyo rajinam ॥ 35 ॥  
 śaśa śīham mahān asuṣi pañca<sup>4</sup> ॥ 7 ॥

<sup>1</sup> nta add B marg <sup>2</sup> sapānnaśrīyo B Cf Atharvaveda I 29, 4, ॥ <sup>3</sup> sa  
 āyānā B. <sup>4</sup> risam B. B has bīsvah <sup>5</sup> ur A ulluṣṭo B cf ver 7 <sup>6</sup> sapānna  
 B, cf ver 7 <sup>7</sup> Le RV, X 152 1-5 giving in all forty verses Their use in the ritual  
 (XII 8) is by verses 1 8 9 14 15 18 19, 20-35 36 40

Athato mamīkaśpah<sup>1</sup> ī bhūtikamāh paspina triratropasito jūtaśo haśhino danian  
 mairam uddhṛtyagnim upasamadha<sup>2</sup> parisaṁhṛja parisiṣṭya paryukt<sup>3</sup> a daksinam  
 jano acyellārato 'gneḥ kamze manim kṛtva hutva heman manau sampatam anayet ।  
 haśhīarcasam ity etabhiḥ pratyrcam<sup>4</sup> asīabhiḥ saplarātram madhusarpīser tāsā-  
 jita triratram ekam ta baddhnyad<sup>5</sup> ghṛtad ulluṣṭo ity elayarcā । aśa evollāram  
 tadābhir hrāḍyāśulagramanīm pratoḍagramanīm ta mulatūgramanīm<sup>6</sup> tād kḥadira  
 saramanīm ta mamśaudane tāsāyitva trirātram ekam ta baddhnyat । aśa evollāram  
 caśasrābhir vṛśābha<sup>7</sup> fragugramanīm ghṛtaudane tāsāyitva triratram ekam va baddhni-  
 jat । aśa evollāram elayairandamanīm śūaudane<sup>8</sup> tāsāyitvā trirātram ekam va  
 baddhnyat । aśa evollāram śolāśābhir<sup>9</sup> bahīam saplarātram madhusarpīser tāsāyitva  
 trirātram ekam tād baddhnyad ghṛtad ulluṣṭa ity elayarcā । aśa evollāram pañcabhir  
 mahavarāhaśyodoham<sup>10</sup> mudgaudane tāsāyitva triratram ekam vā baddhnyat chaklau  
 sah<sup>11</sup> praiśamam haśhichāyājam tanyaghṛe taptā carmany asino vapi juhuyat asino  
 vāpi juhuyat ॥ 8 ॥

॥ Ity Āranyake śraddhāśo 'dhyājān ॥

<sup>1</sup> aśa<sup>2</sup> B <sup>3</sup> pratyrcam B. <sup>4</sup> baddhnyat B. <sup>5</sup> mulatū<sup>6</sup> B, muf<sup>7</sup> A <sup>8</sup> pśābha B  
<sup>9</sup> śaudanā B. <sup>10</sup> śolāśābhir B. <sup>11</sup> mahāvarāhaśod<sup>12</sup> B. o in MSS ॥ often confused  
 with a cf Hoerle Ostroky p 132 The name of a wood of sorts seems essential and udoham  
 (a besom', cf Taittiriya Brahmana, III, 8, 4 3) may be meant The alternative is to take  
 udoham as a gerund <sup>13</sup> sah B.

### ADHYAYA XIII

Athak tairagyasamśkrīe śāre brahmayajñamśho bhavet । oḥa punarmṛiyam  
 jayati । tad u ha rātmā dravītyaśh śraddā jo manītyo mididhāśikṛjā śi । tam elam



vedanunācānena vṛndisante brahmacāryena śāpasa braddhaya jagñenamatākāna ceti  
*Mandukya* 1) śatmad evampre chanlo<sup>1</sup> danta uparatas itākṣṇa braddhavallo bhūtvai  
 many atmatmanam paśyed ita *Mandukya* 1) 30 jam vyññanamayaḥ puruṣaḥ praneṣu  
 sa eṣa neti nety atmauvagrīḥya idam brahmedam ksātram<sup>2</sup> ime deva ime veda ime  
 loka imāni sarvaṇi bhūtanidam sarvaṁ 3aḍ ayaṁ atma 1 sa eṣa śat tvāni anity  
 atmauvogamyō 'ham brahmasmi 1 tad etad brahmapurvaṁ aparaṁ anaparaṁ  
 anantaram abhayaṁ ayaṁ atma brahma sarvaṇubhū 1ḥ anuśasanam 1ḥ *Yajña*  
 1alkya<sup>3</sup> 1 tam etam napuṣṭrīya nūnanīkvasini brūyad ita 1 ya imāni adbhīḥ parigr-  
 hītam rasumāṣṭm dhanasya purnam dadād idam eva tāto bhūya idam eva tāto  
 bhūya ity anusasanam 1<sup>4</sup> tam<sup>5</sup> etam upanīśadam vedatīro na yaīha katham cana  
 vadet<sup>6</sup> 1 tad etad vachhyudītam 1111

11 *Ity Aranyake trayodaśo 'dhyāyoh* 11<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> tichanta A B

<sup>2</sup> kṣātra B

<sup>3</sup> This is an exact quotation save for the insert on of  
 aparaṁ of *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad* II 5 19 B pr m has *brahmo* For the earl er part of  
 that Upaniṣad, II 4 5, 6 IV, 4 25 27, 28 and for the next words VI 3 20 (13 *Kaiva*)

<sup>4</sup> This is clearly an inaccurate reminiscence of *Chandogya Upaniṣad* III, 11 6

<sup>5</sup> tam B

<sup>6</sup> vade B

<sup>7</sup> Simply 11911 11 but (a) this contradicts the colophon to XII 8, (b) there  
 is no connexion with XII (c) A Weber & MS *Catal* II 6 has XIII Cf *J & A S* 1908,  
 pp 380 381

#### ADHYAYA XIV

rcam murchanam jagusum ullamungam 1  
 samnam sīro thartanam mundamundam 1  
 nadhite dhite vedam ahus tam apām 1  
 śīra<sup>1</sup> cātvasau kurute kabandham 1111<sup>2</sup>  
 śīhanur ayaṁ dharaḥaraḥ kilāḥḥḥ 1  
 adhitya vedam na vijanati 30 rtham 1  
 30 rthajñā ita śakālam bhādrām asūte 1  
 nakam eti jñānamdhūtapapma 1111<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> śīra B

<sup>2</sup> The numbers are added by me

<sup>3</sup> It ends with 111011 Really

Adhyaya XIV should be combined with Adhyaya XIII into one Adhyaya but the Berlin MS  
 (Weber *Catal* II, 6) treats this as a separate Adhyaya For ver 2, see *Nirukta* I, 18  
 Burnell *Samhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* p 38

#### ADHYAYA XV

Atha 1amaḥ 1 om 1 namo brahmane nama acāryebhyaḥ 1 *Guṇakhye* *Chāṅkha*  
 yanad asmābhir adhitam 1 *Guṇakhyā* *Śaṅkhyayogā* *Kāholat* *Kausitake* 1 *Kāholat*  
*Kausitake* *Uddalaka*<sup>1</sup> *Aruna* 1 *Uddalaka* *Aruna* *Priyavratat* *Saunapeh* 1 *Priya-*  
*vratat* *Saunapah* *Semapat* 1 *Saunapah* *Saunat* *Prutvohyat* 1 *Saunah* *Pratvohyat*<sup>2</sup>  
*Pratvohyat* 1 *Pratvohye* *Bṛhadīśvat* 1 *Bṛhadīśvat* *Saunayoh* 1 *Saunayur* *Uddalaka* 1

*Uddālako Viśvamanasah | Viśvamanā Vjaktāi | Vjaktvā Sakamaśvatai | Sakamaśvato  
Dharātā | Dharato Viśvāmితrat | Viśvāmित्रा Indrat | Indrah Prajapateh |  
Prajapatir Brahmanah | Brahma Siyambhuḥ | namo brahmane namo brahmane |*

॥ *Ity Āranyake pañcadaśo 'dhyāyāḥ* ॥<sup>1</sup>

॥ *Iti Śāṅkhāyanāranyakam samāptam* ॥

<sup>1</sup> *Uddālako* B    <sup>2</sup> *Somah Pratsvetyak*, Winternitz, *Bodl Catal*, p. 60. A has *Somapih* and *Somah*    <sup>3</sup> *ity Āranyake Upanisado ehadāśo 'dhyāyāḥ* | *its Śāṅkhāyana Upanisadaḥ samap-  
tāḥ | sampurnam | Srikanu Irissanīat* 1837 (= A D 1781) *varse mita pyethaiudā* 15 *śukravat*  
B. But this is all on f. 87, which is a recent restoration and is of no authority. The number  
XV is given in the Berlin MS to the *Āmā*, which ends *its Śāṅkhāyanāranyake pañcadaśo  
'dhyāyāḥ* ॥ *cha* ॥ *samaptāḥ* ॥ *śubham bhavatu* ॥ *vasis samvat* 1734 *varse ardhāśvinaudā* 13 *śanau  
abhyantarānaganyāṇīyārājānagaramadhye | Rājapure vastavyam* *śiśhadikṣitānāmhaminara  
gṛhamāḥ* ॥ *pañcayānīyāṇīrsmāhaputrapautrapuṣṭhanarīham* | The *Āmā* clearly begins with  
the author<sup>4</sup> of the *Āranyaka* i.e. Gṛakhyā, why Oldenberg (*S B E* XXIX 4 §) should  
think the author of the *Sūtras* is meant I cannot understand. See also my *Śāṅkhāyana Ara-  
nyaka*, p. 72.

# INDEX I

## QUOTATIONS FROM RGVEDA.

(The first numbers in brackets denote the reference in the Samhitā. The second, the page and column of Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*. The *prathikas* are given exactly as in the Samhitā text, except that the original forms *in pausa* are restored. References marked § are to the Sankhlyana Āranyaka.)

*Agniṁ nara dīdāstīdāh aranyā* (VII, 1, 1<sup>a</sup>),  
I, 1, 2 (11<sup>b</sup>) § I, 2

*Agnir neta - sa vstrahā* (III, 20, 4<sup>a</sup>), I, 2, 2  
(15<sup>b</sup>)

*Agniś tava hravo vyaṇ* (X, 140, 2<sup>a</sup>), V, 3,  
2 (23<sup>b</sup>)

*adāh tu madhu madhumadhī yodhā* (X, 120,  
3<sup>a</sup>), I, 3, 4, V, 1, 6 (49<sup>b</sup>)

*Aditur mata sa pita sa pitrā* (I, 89, 10<sup>b</sup>),  
III, 1, 5 (50<sup>b</sup>), § VII, 15

*adya na deva Savitā* (V, 82, 4<sup>a</sup>), I, 5, 3 (53<sup>b</sup>),  
§ II, 18

*adāvo jata anābhīter ukīhyā* (IV, 36, 1<sup>a</sup>),  
I, 5, 3 (61<sup>b</sup>)

*anustūdhām anu carisyāmanam* (X, 124, 9<sup>a</sup>),  
II, 3, 3 (67<sup>a</sup>)

*anne samasyi yad asu manisā* (X, 29, 4<sup>a</sup>),  
I, 5, 2 (not in Bloomfield, 75<sup>a</sup>)

*apalyaṇi gupam anipadyāmanam* (I, 164, 31<sup>a</sup>),  
II, 1, 6 (79<sup>b</sup>) Verse cited in full

*apān pān etī svadhāya grīhīta* (I, 164, 38<sup>a</sup>),  
II, 1, 8 (81<sup>a</sup>) Verse cited in full

*abādhy agniś samidha pānam* (V, 1, 1), I,  
1, 1 (89<sup>b</sup>)

*adhā ita puruṣalaya* (VIII, 3, 7<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 2  
(91<sup>b</sup>)

*adhā ita sūra manamā* (VII, 32, 22<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 2  
(91<sup>b</sup>)

*adhā pā vāḥ surādhatam* (VIII, 49, 1<sup>a</sup>), V,  
2, 4 (92<sup>b</sup>)

*adhūr cāo rāyīpate rāyīnam* (VI, 31, 1<sup>a</sup>), V,  
2, 2 (97<sup>a</sup>)

*agm ite astu haryata* (III, 44, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 4  
(105<sup>b</sup>), § II, 9

*ahvayanto maghavanam Indra vajrah* (VII, 31,  
23<sup>a</sup>), V, 1, 6 (128<sup>a</sup>)

*Ahimsa yajurvir itā* (I, 3, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 1, 4 (129<sup>a</sup>)

*asat tu me paritāḥ subhivaga* (X, 27, 1<sup>a</sup>), I,  
2, 1, V, 1, 1 (132<sup>a</sup>) § I, 3

*asya vanasya palitasya hotu* (I, 154, 1<sup>a</sup>), I,  
3, 2, V, 3, 2 (145<sup>b</sup>), § II, 18

*agastma vtrahantamam* (VIII, 74, 4<sup>a</sup>), I, 1,  
1 (154<sup>b</sup>)

*agnim na vavṛhīdāh* (X, 21, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 3, 2  
(155<sup>a</sup>)

*a gha ye agnau* (VIII, 45, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 3 (155<sup>b</sup>)

*a tu na Indra hrantam* (VII, 81, 1<sup>a</sup>), V,  
2, 2 (158<sup>a</sup>)

*a tena yatam manas jayaya* (X, 39, 12<sup>a</sup>),  
II, 3, 8 (149<sup>a</sup>)

*a te maha Indroty ugra* (VII, 28, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 1, 2  
(159<sup>a</sup>)

*a tva ratham yathālaye* (VIII, 68, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 2, 1  
(161<sup>a</sup>) § I, 3

*ad it prathaya vataḥ* (VIII, 6, 20<sup>a</sup>), III, 2,  
4 (162<sup>b</sup>)

*a dhurvo arma* (VII, 34, 4<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 2 (161<sup>b</sup>)

*a na Indro durud ā na asat* (IV, 10, 1<sup>a</sup>), V,  
2, 2 (162<sup>b</sup>)

*a na bhadrāḥ hrataḥ yantu vishvā* (I, 89,  
1<sup>a</sup>), I, 5, 3. (V, 3, 2 as *anobhadrāyantu*, not  
in Bloomfield) (169<sup>a</sup>)

*a me vishvāḥ havyā* (VIII, 90, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 4 (170<sup>b</sup>)





*Mitram ānuṣṭaṣṭam* (I, 2, 7<sup>a</sup>), I, 1, 4 (713<sup>b</sup>) Pādas <sup>a</sup> and <sup>b</sup> are cited.  
*mo su tra vāghatāḥ cana* (VII, 32, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 4 (723<sup>b</sup>)

*ya anāyāḥ paratāṣṭaḥ* (VI, 45, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (724<sup>a</sup>)  
*ya Indra samapātamaḥ* (VIII, 12, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (725<sup>a</sup>)

*ya ekā id vidāyate* (I, 84, 7<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (726<sup>b</sup>)  
*yah satraḥa vicarsanaḥ* (VI, 46, 3), V, 2, 4 (727<sup>b</sup>)

*yatra brahmā paratamaḥ* (IX, 113, 6<sup>a</sup>), III, 2, 4 (741<sup>b</sup>)

*yad agna māt samut dhatuḥ* (X, 11, 8), V, 1, 1 (749<sup>b</sup>)

*yad anis yac ca dūrāṣṭa* (IX, 67, 31), III, 2, 4 (751<sup>a</sup>)

*yad Indra praṅ apag udāt* (VIII, 4, 1), V, 2, 4 (753<sup>b</sup>)

*yad Indrahāni yadāḥ tvam* (VIII, 24, 1), V, 2, 5 (754<sup>a</sup>)

*yad vāṇa* (X, 74, 6<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 3 (756<sup>b</sup>)

*yas tignāṣṭro vṛṣāḥ na bhīmaḥ* (VII, 19, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 3 (757<sup>b</sup>)

*yas tityaja sacivāni sakāḥ yam* (X, 71, 6<sup>a</sup>), III, 2, 4 (757<sup>b</sup>, where the variant in TA is not noted), § VIII, 6 Verse cited in full

*yasya iyac cāmbaram madē* (VI, 43, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (774<sup>b</sup>)

*ya Indra bhūya adharaḥ* (VIII, 97, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 4 (778<sup>b</sup>), § II 9

*yvad dyaḥpṛthivīḥ savat at dat* (X, 114, 8<sup>a</sup>), I, 3, 8 (786<sup>a</sup>)

*yvad brahma vṛṣṭiṣṭam idvāt vāt* (X, 114, 8<sup>a</sup>), I, 3, 8 (786<sup>a</sup>)

*yo jūṣa eva prāṭhamo manatvam* (II, 12, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 5, 2, V, 3, 1 (808<sup>b</sup>)

*yonis ta Indra sadvāḥ akṛṣṭa* (VIII, 24, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 3, 5 (810<sup>b</sup>)

*yo vāṇa carāṇinām* (VIII, 70, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 4 (812<sup>b</sup>)

*raikhanṭaram a jabhara Varisṭhaḥ* (X, 181, 1<sup>a</sup>), III, 1, 6 (817<sup>b</sup>)

*ratrīṣṭa* (X, 127, 1<sup>a</sup>), III, 2, 4 (823<sup>b</sup>)

*retatr naḥ sadhamaḥ* (I, 30, 13<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (830<sup>b</sup>)

*vane na va yo adhaya cakṣu* (X, 29, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 5, 2, V, 3, 1 (837<sup>a</sup>)

*vayam ghaṭva satatāṣṭaḥ* (VIII, 33, 1), V, 2, 4 (838<sup>a</sup>)

*vaj sa a yāḥ darhāṣṭa* (I, 2, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 1, 4 (860<sup>a</sup>)

Pādas <sup>a</sup> and <sup>b</sup> are cited.

*vāṇaḥpṛthivya savat* (III, 27, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (863<sup>a</sup>)

*vāṇaḥpṛthivya savat bhūṇaḥ* (X, 120, 2<sup>a</sup>), I, 3, 4 (863<sup>a</sup>), § II, 1

*vidhūm dadṛṣṇam samant bahūnam* (X, 35, 5<sup>a</sup>), V, 3, 1 (869<sup>a</sup>)

*vīṣṭaḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (VIII, 74, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 1, 1 (877<sup>b</sup>), § II, 2

*vāṇaḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam pṛthivyaḥ* (III, 2, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 3, 3 (906<sup>b</sup>)

*sakāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (VIII, 24, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (951<sup>b</sup>)

*samitāḥ samitāḥ* (VIII, 46, 10<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (966<sup>a</sup>)

*samitāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (VIII, 44, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 1, 1 (980<sup>b</sup>)

*sakāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (X, 114, 8<sup>a</sup>), V, 3, 8 (1001<sup>a</sup>)

*sata at tvam namitāḥ Indra some* (VI, 23, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 2 (1015<sup>a</sup>)

*sarvāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (I, 4, 1<sup>a</sup>), V, 2, 5 (1021<sup>b</sup>)

*sarjā dīmā jagatāḥ* (I, 115, 1<sup>a</sup>), II, 2, 4, III, 2, 3 (1025<sup>b</sup>)

*savad at tvam a yāḥ* (VIII, 2, 18), V, 2, 3 (1054<sup>b</sup>)

*savad at tvam a yāḥ* (VIII, 2, 18), V, 2, 3 (1054<sup>b</sup>)

*savad at tvam a yāḥ* (VIII, 2, 18), V, 2, 3 (1054<sup>b</sup>)

*sakāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (VII, 1, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 1, 1 (1065<sup>b</sup>)

*sakāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (II, 2, 1<sup>a</sup>), I, 1, 1 (1072<sup>b</sup>)

In the Śānti verses (see Crit Note on I, 2) also occur —

*sakāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (IX, 31, 3<sup>a</sup>), (not in Bloomfield, 96<sup>b</sup>)

*sakāḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (II, 43, 3<sup>a</sup>), (not in Bloomfield, 186<sup>b</sup>)

*kayaḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (IV, 31, 1<sup>a</sup>), (319<sup>a</sup>)

*kayaḥpṛthivya vṛṣṭiṣṭam* (IV, 31, 1<sup>a</sup>), (not in Bloomfield, 321<sup>b</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> In view of the variants in the MSS I have given only the first Pādas. All the verses are assumed to be quoted in full.

*tac sakur devakham* (VII, 66, 16), (not in Bloomfield, 1864)

*tuans Agne wratapa* are (VIII, 11, 1), (not in Bloomfield, 450<sup>b</sup>)

Śāradraṃ karmadhāra śrīṃyasa dāvaḥ (I, 89, 8<sup>a</sup>),  
(66, 4<sup>a</sup>, where only the *pratiḥa* is given)

*blādrām no api wīlaya manāh* (X, 30, 1<sup>o</sup>),  
(not in Bloomfield, 664<sup>o</sup>)

The following occur in the Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, VII-XII

*Aditiā dyauṣ Aditir antarikṣam* (I, 89, 10<sup>a</sup>),  
VII, 15 (10<sup>b</sup>). Verse cited in full.

adhyaryas bharatendrasa samam (II, 14, 1<sup>a</sup>),  
II, 15 (59<sup>a</sup>)

astary Agniś himnadāhar arkaś (I, 141, 13<sup>o</sup>),  
II, 18 (136<sup>o</sup>)

■ *mandrair Indra haribhāṣa* (III, 45, 1<sup>a</sup>), II 9 (126<sup>b</sup>)

*Indraah mīśra samasta* (VIII, 13, 1<sup>o</sup>), II, 10 (218<sup>o</sup>)

*mita* syn *mitā* *Sarastvati purāṇa* (VII, 95, 4<sup>o</sup>),  
I, 2 (253<sup>a</sup>)

ud' voyazh tsamarsk p'ost (I, 50, 10<sup>a</sup>), VIII, 5  
(163<sup>b</sup>). Verse cited in full.

1<sup>a</sup>), I, 3 (263<sup>b</sup>)

18 (176<sup>a</sup>)

II, 4 (194<sup>b</sup>)

As a first example we consider (IV, 43) <sup>10</sup>  
I. 2 (1986)

Am u freishal Am jantika na njagan (I, 161, 1<sup>a</sup>), II, 18 (327<sup>b</sup>)

*kuvid anga namasa ye vydharaṇa* (VII 91, 1<sup>a</sup>),  
I, 2 (319<sup>b</sup>)

As was found earlier, the results (IV, 55a, 1<sup>a</sup>),  
I, 2 (335<sup>b</sup>)

18 հիմնադրվում է Վահագնիկոս (I, 160, 1<sup>ա</sup>),  
II, 18 (445<sup>ը</sup>)

*deuayor eis suryot kahanam* (VII, 61, 3<sup>b</sup>), I, 2  
(491<sup>a</sup>)

*dvareṣu śrāyaṇa śubhāge vyasar* (VII, 95, 6<sup>n</sup>),  
I, 2 (813<sup>b</sup>)

na nind'sma cannaqas ya mahakulak (I, 16, 1<sup>a</sup>). II, 18 (x30<sup>a</sup>)

śam na Indrāgñī śāvatant avobhāś (VII, 35, 1<sup>a</sup>), (917<sup>a</sup>, where only the *prastāva* is given)

Same as *Mitra* from *Varunah* (I, 90, 9\*), (not in Bloomfield, 918\*)

(1041<sup>8</sup>, where only the *pratiśa* is given, as in

*syona pŕikṛta* *dhāra* (I, 22, 15<sup>v</sup>), (1046<sup>v</sup>)

*Przyjacie na tożd eliny anych* (X, 121, 10<sup>a</sup>),  
XII, 2, v 8 (612<sup>a</sup>) Verses in full

*bal itika tad'asjare dhays darlatam* (I, 141, 1<sup>a</sup>), II, 16 (644<sup>b</sup>). Insert *tad'* in Friedlander's text

ճշմարտության արդյունքն ու բարոյական (V, 55, 2<sup>b</sup>),  
II, 18 (650<sup>b</sup>)

maḥas tan nama gūḥyam puruṣārṇ (X, 55, 2\*),  
VII, 30 (60a<sup>17</sup>). Verses cited in full.

makāñ Indre upadā cārayiprāñ (VI, 19, 1<sup>4</sup>),  
I. 3 (695<sup>b</sup>)

*mā na stencchyo yo abhi drahya padē* (II, 13, 16<sup>a</sup>), VII, 13 (706<sup>a</sup>) Verse cited in full

ya ets of *Asyaf carmanensis* (VI, 22, 1<sup>a</sup>), II, 4  
(216<sup>b</sup>)

same *suryarya daktadornata* (IV, 43, 2<sup>a</sup>), I, 2  
(728<sup>b</sup>)

juvat larvi tante juvat sjaik (VIII, 91, 4<sup>a</sup>),  
I, 2 (786<sup>a</sup>)

ഗുരുവായൂർ രാജാജി മഹാജ്ഞാനി (VII, 9r, 4<sup>b</sup>),  
I, 2 (1866)

vide vyākhyāya daktara mahāṣi hi tat (VIII, 13,  
10. II, 37 (26-8))

višā ānandā dīkṣakā (V, 37, 6<sup>a</sup>), II, 18 (885b)  
viśā ānandā dīkṣakā (X, 38, 1<sup>a</sup>). II, 4

(891<sup>a</sup>)

hara itika molañ ara (X, 153, 1<sup>a</sup>), II, 15,  
211, 7 (923<sup>b</sup>)

see *Praktische Anweisung* (VIII, 63 4<sup>a</sup>), II, 15 (974<sup>b</sup>)

*stahyato Farus Afru mariat* (IV, 55, 1<sup>o</sup>),  
I, 2 (1005<sup>o</sup>)

*stefaram in maghawan arya vardhaya* (VIII, 1<sup>a</sup>), II, 9 (1041<sup>b</sup>)

*Stasius Patarys vepreke* (VIII, 6, 1<sup>o</sup>), II, 8  
(1043<sup>n</sup>)

## INDEX II

### QUOTATIONS FROM OTHER SOURCES THAN THE RIGVEDA, NIVIDS, PRAISAS, ETC

(All the Padas of metrical passages are given as in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* (*Harvard Oriental Series*, Vol. V, 1906) Metrical passages are marked (v) The references in brackets are to page and column of the *Concordance*)

- agnir vnanadharyah prathitra svadā dhi jā  
sam V, 1 1 (14<sup>b</sup>)  
atichandāsā tra (chandasādhanā) V, 1, 4  
(348<sup>b</sup>, under gayatrina tra, &c. The separate  
Mantras should rather be given separately)  
attha samur va tanto astu bharyam (v), I, 3 4  
(47<sup>b</sup>)  
dnu dyavaprythivī purvādhvau V, 1, 3 (v) (64<sup>b</sup>)  
dnu mām Indro dnu mām Bharyādīh, V, 2,  
1 (v) (66<sup>a</sup>)  
dnu mām dītrādvratna vāhātum V, 2, 1 (v)  
(66<sup>a</sup>)  
dnu samiso dīhā, IV, 1 (v) (66<sup>b</sup>)  
dnu sōmo dnu vāg dity dnu, V, 1, 1 (v) (67<sup>b</sup>)  
anāritam vnanayam dyaur vnanadharyā hā  
yāsam V, 1, 1 (76<sup>a</sup>, with the misreading  
"dāris", which is in no text or MS. and is  
contradicted by the context)  
dnt vād vāhāh sircasmad dātaram, V, 3, 2 (v)  
(not in Bloomfield)  
amant v a vāhā yajña va prabhū (v) 1 pra  
bhū bharyam, V, 1, 1 (74<sup>a</sup>)  
dnnatvāh vād prāritam gāhāgam, V, 3, 2 (v)  
(not in Bloomfield)  
apānam antukhāra V, 1, 4 (31<sup>b</sup>)  
apānāya tvā (ulīkādāmi), V, 1, 4 (51<sup>a</sup>)  
amriyāya iriyam mahīm V, 3, 2 (v) (102<sup>a</sup>)  
ayadātaram amriam dāhānam, V, 3, 2 (v)  
(not in Bloomfield)  
arcanty arādm devadā h) marāhā, V, 2, 2 (v)  
(113<sup>b</sup>)  
avradāme hūnoti vā apyad rayāh, V, 2, 2 (v)  
(125<sup>a</sup>, under avrate)  
ahar tra soam vārit va prāyā bharyam, V,  
1, 1 (130<sup>a</sup>)  
Adityas tvā jātāh &c., V, 1, 4 (165<sup>a</sup>, cf 164<sup>b</sup>),  
S I, 7  
anusulāhna tra (chandasādhanāmi), V, 1, 4  
(334<sup>a</sup>)  
ape vāra va vādāya va vāpam bharyam, V,  
1, 1 (171<sup>a</sup>)  
ahāts tvām ahātsvāhāh (v), IV, 1 (176<sup>a</sup>)  
d yāts tvā mātā (v) IV, 1 (179<sup>b</sup>)  
dyak prānam me dhātāya V, 3 1 (180<sup>b</sup>, cf  
Katyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 4 12, where  
prānam is vāt vā)  
d yā mātāya manyāte (v), IV, 1 (183<sup>a</sup>)  
d stobhāt tvā yurā d Indrāh (v), V, 1, 2  
(193<sup>b</sup>)  
idam madhū, V, 1, 1 (204<sup>a</sup>)  
idam madhū 3 V, 1, 1 (204<sup>a</sup>, no separate head),  
vā vāhā sāmāyah parvāt (hāh) (v) V, 2, 1  
(205<sup>a</sup>, as vā vāh &c.)  
Indrāh hārmāhānam amritam tyāma (v) V, 3,  
1 (207<sup>a</sup> see also note for parallel)  
Indrāh pātis tātātāmo pātāva d (v), V, 1, 1  
(207<sup>a</sup>)  
Indrāh dātāhāh pātāva dātāh (v), V, 2, 1  
(214<sup>a</sup>)  
Indram dāhāya sādhye (v), IV, 1 (210<sup>b</sup>, cf  
RV, I, III, 3 5<sup>a</sup>)



- Indraya dhātūdam dīkṣak* (v) V, 2, 1 (215<sup>b</sup>)  
*Indraya rīntyaṇ brāhī* (v), V, 2, 1 (216<sup>a</sup>)  
*Indra tade tām u tūm* (v) IV, 1 (218<sup>b</sup>)  
*Indro tātām tātupati* (v), V, 2, 1 (228<sup>b</sup>)  
*imaṇi tūrasūtam pīḥa*, V, 1, 1 (231<sup>b</sup>)  
*ītam na āhīrāvāramā Lātānīham* (v), V, 2, 1 (239<sup>a</sup>)  
*īte āi Sakti* (v), IV, 1 (246<sup>a</sup>)  
*ukhāṣi yaya tamaraya*, V, 3, 2, 3 (one is pre fixed), (246<sup>b</sup>, 313<sup>a</sup>)  
*uḥa brāhī mādīkumāte kīyānīh* (v), V, 2, 2 (266<sup>a</sup> as *uḥaḥṛāṣi*)  
*uḥaṣi tūvādāha* (quasi verse), IV, 1 (272<sup>a</sup>)  
*uḥa mādhyaya manyāṣe* (quasi verse), IV, 1 (272<sup>b</sup>)  
*ṛidm talyāṇi tūyūyīmī tūrasūdam* (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)  
*ṛāhur tūgāḥ eṇā* (v), V, 2, 1 (286<sup>a</sup> as *tātūm* &c., which rather belongs to the end of the preceding Pada)  
*eṇā ta mātā dhātūyāḥ* (v), V, 3, 2 (300<sup>a</sup> as *ukhāḥkūyāḥ*)  
*eṇā āi dēdā 3 ā* IV, 1 (305<sup>a</sup>, no *pīnti*)  
*eṇā āi Pūnd 3 u*, IV, 1 (305<sup>a</sup>, no *pīnti*)  
*eṇā āi Pūnd 3 u* IV, 1 (305<sup>a</sup>, no *pīnti*)  
*eṇā āi tātūh* IV, 1 (309<sup>a</sup>)  
*eṇā āindrā 3* IV, 1 (305<sup>a</sup> as *āindram*)  
*eṇā āy agnā 3 ā* IV, 1 (305<sup>a</sup>, no *pīnti*)  
*eṇā āy eṇā* IV, 1 (305<sup>b</sup>)  
*esa brāhmin* V, 2, 1 (*prastāna* only) (306<sup>b</sup>)  
*chy eva 3 tādā mādhu*, V, 1, 1 (309<sup>a</sup>)  
*auhapīdhanā naktūṣi* &c. (v), III, 2, 5 (316<sup>a</sup> gives other citations but not this)  
*aurmahāna tva* (*chandasaṇḍhāna*), V, 2, 4 (348<sup>a</sup>)  
*ārdmā chandā ṛidm brāhī* (v), IV, 1 (356<sup>b</sup>)  
*gīyatrena tva* (*chandasaṇḍhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348<sup>a</sup>)  
*gāva tva pūmarāhūva nīkūnām tva mātūyā*  
*dāyāsam*, V, 2, 1 (348<sup>b</sup>)  
*caru mam tva tūyīṣe* (v) III, 2, 5 (not in Bloomfield)  
*ekīṣva abāi na naya* (v) IV, 1 (368<sup>a</sup>)  
*jagatena tva* (*chandasaṇḍhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348<sup>a</sup>)  
*jītarām āparajulam*, IV, 1 (382<sup>b</sup>)  
*jyāur āhāur āprastūvādā pūrasam* (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)  
*ūpastāna Indrayasthām zahāradhāram*, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)  
*tām mādye hāvamāte* (v) IV, 1 (406<sup>b</sup>)  
*kāhkar ma tād āhūkva*, V, 3, 2 (424<sup>a</sup>)  
*tjāh prandīyāyāstānam mādānāh*, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)  
*tūmāḥm tūstām apyastām* V, 3, 2 (440<sup>b</sup>)  
*tā na dēvā mātūvādā hārmā yāhāṣa*, V, 1, 1 (441<sup>b</sup>)  
*trastūhāna tva* (*chandasaṇḍhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348<sup>b</sup>)  
*todm āy tva tūve* (v), V, 2, 2 (456<sup>a</sup>, cf. IV, IV, 3, 2, 7<sup>a</sup>)  
*dentāh parūṣṭa pātūḥ* (v), III, 2, 5 (not in Bloomfield)  
*dadhīpīndām dhātūdam tātūh* (dub read) (v), V, 2, 1 (475<sup>a</sup>)  
*dhāpīdēna tva* (*chandasaṇḍhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348<sup>b</sup>)  
*dhēnu pūvādā dhātūh tūrasam prandī* (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)  
*mamas te gīyatraya*, V, 1, 2 (533<sup>a</sup>)  
*mamas te brāhī* V, 1, 2 (533<sup>b</sup>)  
*mamas te āhāraya* V, 2, 2 (533<sup>b</sup>)  
*mamas te nāhantayaya* V, 1, 2 (533<sup>b</sup>)  
*nādhāṣa ā dadhāna* (dub read) (v) V, 2, 1 (545<sup>b</sup>)  
*nandm tām mādhyam tām tūyāṣe* (v), IV, 1 (565<sup>b</sup>)  
*pāṣṭaṇḍhāyā stomaṣya* &c., V, 1, 5 (562<sup>a</sup>)  
*pāṣṭa tūām mē dhūkva* V, 3, 1 (578<sup>a</sup>)  
*pāṣṭena tva* (*chandasaṇḍhāna*), V, 1, 4 (348<sup>a</sup>)  
*pātūro ma tūvām tādā mē dhātūm*, V, 1, 1 (583<sup>a</sup>)  
*pīrasam tām ārdmā ma Indra* (v), V, 2, 1 (588<sup>a</sup>)  
*pūvā yād mē dīa vyāhīḥ* V, 2, 1 (594<sup>a</sup>)  
*pūvā tva yād tēhāṣa mūdām* (v) V, 2, 2 (not in Bloomfield as a separate entry)  
*pūyānta rāyām dhātūhā tām Indra* (v), V, 2, 2 (597<sup>b</sup>)  
*pūvāḥ tātūhā tūyāṣe* (v) IV, 1 (598<sup>a</sup>)  
*pūrasam yād te mātūvādā* (v), IV, 1 (598<sup>b</sup>)  
*pūrasam pūrasam* (v), IV, 1 (598<sup>b</sup>)

*prthivyaparām Vāruṇādyaśamanam*, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)

*prthivīparāḥ śarvātāḥ svarāḥ* (v), V, 1, 1 (605<sup>b</sup>)

*prācīana prā cetaya* (v), IV, 1 (603<sup>a</sup>)

*Prajāpatiḥ idān brāhmaṇa* (v), V, 3, 1 (610<sup>b</sup>)

*prāṭi tana pīṭi* (v), V, 2, 1 (618<sup>a</sup>)

*prāṭiṣṭha hrdayayya śrvaṇam* (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)

*prāṭiṣṭha jñāyaya Vytrāḥam* (v), IV, 1 (623<sup>b</sup>)

*prāṭiṣṭha śrāyaya* (v), V, 2, 1 (628<sup>b</sup>)

*pranāmi anuprenkṣanta*, V, 1, 4 (635<sup>b</sup>)

*pranāya tva (ulīkṣanti)*, V, 1, 4 (637<sup>a</sup>)

*pramāṇi tacam vadīyanti*, &c., V, 1, 5 (641<sup>b</sup>), in the parallel passages from Līṭyayana and Śaṅkhayana Bloomfield reads *svargam apī yan* and *svargam iṣyan* respectively, I think wrongly, Ś I, 8 (with variants)

*brahmana* ||| *(chandasoduhanti)*, V, 1, 4 (348<sup>a</sup>)

*brāhmaṇa prajāṁ me dhukṛta*, V, 3, 2 (658<sup>b</sup>)

*brāhmaṇaś lokē śratatam tva iṣyama bhūyasaṁ*, V, 1, 1 (661<sup>a</sup>)

*bhūva vājasaṇi pātar vāṇāṁ dnu* (v), IV, 1 (670<sup>b</sup>)

*bhūtiśāyā tva*, V, 1, 4 (671<sup>b</sup>, 672<sup>a</sup>)

*bhūv bhūvaḥ svar*, I, 3, 2, V, 1, 4 (674<sup>a</sup>)

*bhūv bhūvaḥ śār śrāyā iśā* 'ai, V, 3, 2 (not separated in Bloomfield)

*mādhīṣṭha Indra vājra* (v) *grmāḥṣṭha* (v), V, 1, 1 (676<sup>b</sup>)

*mādhīṣṭha vajrinam pīṣṭe* (v), IV, 1 (676<sup>b</sup>)

*mādhīṣṭha vājasaṇi* (v), V, 2, 2 (677<sup>a</sup>, cf RV, VIII, 4, 18<sup>a</sup>, 28, 6<sup>a</sup>)

*māṭiśa māṭiṣṭha puruṣāram māṭiṣṭha* (v), V, 2, 1 (678<sup>b</sup>)

*mana vapurvan vāyur ita ślokaśūv bhūyasaṁ*, V, 1, 1 (683<sup>b</sup>)

*mayi kṛtāḥ*, V, 1, 5 (689<sup>a</sup>)

*mayi gṛhīṭā*, V, 1, 5 (689<sup>a</sup>)

*mayi bhāgāḥ*, V, 1, 5 (689<sup>b</sup>)

*mayi bhūktīḥ*, V, 1, 5 (689<sup>b</sup>)

*mayi bhūyāḥ*, V, 1, 5 (689<sup>b</sup>)

*mayi māḥam*, V, 1, 5 (690<sup>a</sup>)

*mayi yataḥ*, V, 1, 5 (690<sup>a</sup>)

*mayi śrāṭi*, V, 1, 5 (690<sup>b</sup>)

*mayi ślokaḥ*, V, 1, 5 (690<sup>a</sup>)

*mayi ślokaḥ*, V, 1, 5 (690<sup>a</sup>)

*mayi ślokaḥ*, V, 1, 5 (690<sup>a</sup>)

*maṛdā lokānam aśi* (v), V, 3, 1 (719<sup>a</sup>, treated apparently as prose)

*yāś śvāstīḥ śrīṇam* (v), IV, 1 (769<sup>b</sup>)

*yāś tva śvāstīḥ śrīṇam* (v), V, 2, 2 (762<sup>a</sup>)

*yāśśrīṇam aśīṣṭaś tājō yājō vānam śāḥ* (v), V, 2, 1 (two Pādas, in 777<sup>a</sup> the first Pāda is given, with the remark that the Aranyaka omits *yujāḥ*, but the second Pāda is not given under *yujāḥ*).

*yājō vānam śāḥ*, see preceding

*yē Agnīṣṭhāś uta va yājatrāḥ* (v), V, 1, 1 (795<sup>b</sup>)

*yē yajamaḥ*, V, 3, 2 (804<sup>b</sup>, without *pāṭi*)

*yē mādhīṣṭha māṭiṣṭha* (v), IV, 1 (811<sup>b</sup>)

*yājōḥ pūṣṭasāmandrāṁ* (v), V, 1, 1 (810<sup>a</sup>, cf RV, II, 41, 9<sup>b</sup>)

*yājō vājaya vājrayāḥ* (v), IV, 1 (823<sup>b</sup>)

*Rudras tva śratatīḥ* &c., V, 1, 4 (828<sup>b</sup>), Ś I, 7.

*lokam brāhmaṇavarcaśam adbhāṇi yajñasāmr dāṁ me dhukṛta*, V, 3, 2 (832<sup>a</sup>)

*aiśi śi Śatrūḥ*, IV, 1 (847<sup>a</sup>)

*aiśi śi Śatrū vāṇāṁ dnu*, IV, 1 (847<sup>a</sup>)

*varāṇaś tva yajatrāṇa* &c., V, 1, 4 (848<sup>b</sup>), Ś I, 7, 10<sup>a</sup>, V, 1, 5 (852<sup>a</sup>)

*vaś dnu iomaya śrīṇam*, V, 2, 2 (853<sup>a</sup>)

*Vajrah Pūṣṭi Varuṇaś Śīma Agnīḥ* (v), V, 1, 1 (860<sup>b</sup>)

*vāṇā māṭiṣṭha vāṇā māṭiṣṭha* (v), IV, 1 (867<sup>a</sup>)

*vāṇā māṭiṣṭha vāṇā māṭiṣṭha*, IV, 1 (867<sup>a</sup>)

*vāṇā vājōḥ vājīṇam* (v), IV, 1 (867<sup>a</sup>)

*vājō māṭiṣṭha vājō māṭiṣṭha* (v), V, 2, 2 (871<sup>a</sup>)

*aiśi vā aiśi vāṇā* (v), I, 4, 3 (not in Bloomfield, perhaps as not being considered a Mantra)

*vāṇāḥ dnuṁ vāṇāḥ na śi bhāra* (v), V, 2, 2 (879<sup>a</sup>)

*śīṇam pūṣṭiśīṇam* (v), V, 2, 1 (881<sup>a</sup>, where the whole *hac* with *pūṣṭi* is given as if one Pāda)

*śīṇam pūṣṭiśīṇam* &c., V, 1, 4 (886<sup>b</sup>)

*śīṇam pūṣṭiśīṇam*, V, 1, 4 (900<sup>b</sup>, where *hac* quotation is given as *anu* *śīṇam*)

*śīṇam pūṣṭiśīṇam*, V, 1, 4 (900<sup>b</sup>)



zan me mamasā &c. II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 853<sup>b</sup>) Ś VII, 1  
 tadāya ma ahi śīhā II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 903<sup>b</sup>) Cf Ś VII, 1  
 ita na śāntama bhāva (v) (935<sup>a</sup>), Ś VII, 1  
 śi utam me ma prahāṣi, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 940<sup>a</sup>)

satyam vadisyāma II, 7 (938<sup>a</sup>), Ś VII, 1  
 sarvāḥ satyamaḥ śābala utīṣṭhams (v) (not in Bloomfield)  
 sarvāyaś vaca śamaḥ (v) (Cf. supra.)  
 samvṛtāḥ Sarvavāśa (v), (1020<sup>b</sup>), Ś VII, 1  
 surya pyatasam brūhāḥ (not in Bloomfield, but cf 40<sup>a</sup>), Ś VII, 1, IX, 1

In II, 3, 8 the following Ślokas occur

tatra devāḥ sarva eḥam bhāvanānti, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup> (391<sup>b</sup>)  
 tatra devāḥ sarvayujā bhāvanānti 3<sup>a</sup> (391<sup>b</sup>)  
 tad vīrya ya kṛtavya n utīṣṭhāmi 3<sup>a</sup> (397<sup>a</sup>)  
 ita na prapannānti prahāṣya brāhmanā, 4<sup>a</sup> (433<sup>b</sup>)

namajātāḥ samastṛjāḥ brūte 'śīh, 3<sup>a</sup> (547<sup>a</sup>)  
 nainam aītrīṣṭhāmi brūvan 1<sup>b</sup> (559<sup>a</sup>)  
 nainam vaca śṛṇyam brūvan 5<sup>a</sup> (559)

śṛṇuṣvāṣam na brūvaṣṭu śnam 5<sup>a</sup> (952<sup>b</sup>).

yaś caryāḥ kṛuram yaś colhāṣam 3<sup>a</sup> (735<sup>a</sup>)  
 yaś akṣarāṁ pāṭhāṁśīham sameti 1<sup>a</sup> (749<sup>a</sup>)  
 yaś akṣarāś akṣarānti śis yuṣṭam, 2<sup>a</sup> (749<sup>b</sup>)  
 yaś vaca om śis yaś cā neli, 3<sup>a</sup> (759<sup>b</sup>)  
 yaśmin nama samastṛjāḥ brūte 'śīh, 4<sup>a</sup> (773<sup>b</sup>)  
 yujā yuṣṭa śīhī yaś samvāḥantī, 1<sup>b</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup> (791<sup>a</sup>)  
 vādāḥ vadānti kṛcāṁ, 5<sup>a</sup> (835<sup>a</sup>)

satyāśa satyam anna jatra yujyāḥ, 1<sup>a</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup> (960<sup>a</sup>)  
 svargam lokam apyēti vātīvan, 4<sup>a</sup> (1030<sup>b</sup>).

Prose formulae in Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka I II VII-XIV (Most of these are not in Bloomfield, I edit Concordance)

annam gṛhṇīhīḥ, XI, 8  
 annam eva śīhīro vāśanti kṛtavyāna cānāśā, XI, 8  
 annatam annāśā bhī jaśam XI, 6, 8  
 aśīne me vīryuśāḥ pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ XI, 5  
 aśāne me vīryuśāḥ pratisṭhīḥ aśāne āśī loṇe, XI, 6  
 aśā eva śīhīro vāśanti śṛṇuṣṭhīṣṭa cānāśā, XI, 8  
 arko 'ti Ś I, 7 (113<sup>b</sup>)  
 aśmāna śīhīro vāśanti śṛṇuṣṭa cānāśā XI, 8  
 aśmāni me brāhṁa pratisṭhīṣṭam svāḥ, XI, 5  
 aśmāni me brāhṁa pratisṭhīṣṭam āśma āśī loṇe, XI, 6  
 mīṣāme me Pṛjānyāḥ pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ XI, 5  
 mīṣāme me Pṛjānyāḥ pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ āśī loṇe, XI, 6  
 gṛhṇīṣṭam nāgṛhṇīṣṭam, XI, 8  
 cakṣuḥ me āśīnyāḥ pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ XI, 5  
 cakṣuḥ me āśīnyāḥ pratisṭhīṣṭaś cakṣuḥ āśī loṇe, XI, 6  
 tat satyam dṛṣṭvānt XI, 6, 8  
 tṛṣṭu eva śīhīro vāśanti śṛṇuṣṭhīṣṭa cānāśā, XI, 8

nīḥam eva śīhīro vāśanti śṛṇuṣṭyena cānāśā, XI, 8  
 furuss mānīḥ, XI, 8  
 Pṛjānyāḥ eva śīhīro vāśanti aśīcānāśāna cānāśā XI, 8  
 Pṛjānyāḥ vāśantīṣṭa vāśanti pratisṭhīṣṭa, I, 7  
 prānāḥ sūtram, XI, 8  
 prāne me vīryuśāḥ pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ, XI, 5  
 prāne me vīryuśāḥ pratisṭhīṣṭaś vāśanti āśī loṇe, XI, 6  
 bala me śīhīro vāśanti pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ, XI, 5  
 bala me śīhīro vāśanti pratisṭhīṣṭaś bala me āśī loṇe XI, 6  
 Brāhṁāṣṭu eva śīhīro vāśanti bṛhṁāṣṭa cānāśā XI, 8  
 Brāhṁāṣṭu śīhīro vāśanti śṛṇuṣṭa cānāśā XI, 8  
 mānāṣṭu me cāśmāṣṭu pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ XI, 5  
 mānāṣṭu me cāśmāṣṭu pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ āśī loṇe, XI, 6  
 mānyam me śīhīro vāśanti pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ XI, 5  
 mānyam me śīhīro vāśanti pratisṭhīṣṭaś mānyam āśī loṇe, XI, 6  
 mīṣāme āśī loṇe me vāśanti XI, 6, 8  
 mūrḍhāṁ me āśī loṇe pratisṭhīṣṭaś svāḥ XI, 5  
 mūrḍhāṁ me āśī loṇe pratisṭhīṣṭaś mūrḍhā āśī loṇe, XI, 6

*pat satyasaṃ lāka deva*, VII, 17 (probably *pat* is not quoted)

*raṣṭāṇi eva sikhira vāṣṭāni suvarāṇyena cāhaṇḍāni*, XI, 8

*relāni ma nṣaḥ pratisthitaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 5

*relāni ma nṣaḥ pratisthita relā hrdaye*, XI, 6

*lūḥni eva sikhira vāṣṭāni anuṣaḥṇa cāhaṇḍāni*, XI, 8

*evāni ma Agnāḥ pratisthitaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 5

*evāni ma Agnāḥ pratisthita Agnir hrdaye*, XI, 6

*harare me pṛthivī pratisthita svāḥa*, XI, 5

*harare me pṛthivī prati dhīr harareḥ hrdaye*, XI, 6

*hratre me dīśaḥ pratisthitaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 5

*hratre me dīśaḥ pratisthitaḥ hratreḥ hrdaye*, XI, 6

Verbs other than *Rgvēdī* in Śāṅkhayana to XII and XIV are to verses

*Agnir eva kṛtāni vāḥaḥ śaḥ purnāni*, XII, 9<sup>a</sup>

*Agni yajāṃ yajāṃ sam arṇaya*, XII, 15<sup>a</sup> (Taittiriya Samhitā, V, 7, 4 3<sup>a</sup>, with the reading *\*amam* Bloomfield, 17<sup>b</sup>)

*Agni varcarāṇām karu*, XII, 2<sup>a</sup> (Atharvaveda, III, 21, 5<sup>a</sup>, Bloomfield 28<sup>b</sup>)

*adātya evāni ma vyṇāsi yā vāḥam* XIV, 2<sup>a</sup> (Nirukta, I, 18<sup>b</sup> Comm on Samhitopaniṣad, p. 38 ed. Burdell)

*anuvācāmadhyastīra* [or] *anuvācāstīra*, XII, 12<sup>a</sup>

*anenevāni eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XII, 10<sup>a</sup>

*anenevāni Vṛtrāni cāni* XII, 30<sup>a</sup> (Cf Atharvaveda VIII, 5, 3<sup>a</sup>, Bloomfield, 68<sup>b</sup>)

*anāḥvāni eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XII, 7 (Vajrasaneyi Samhitā V, 43 Bloomfield 70<sup>b</sup>)

*adāḥ evāni pṛthivyaḥ svāḥa* XII, 31<sup>a</sup> (91<sup>a</sup>)

*adāḥ eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa* XII, 18<sup>a</sup> (Cf Taittiriya Samhitā, V, 7, 4 4<sup>a</sup>)

*amṛtāni eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XII, 32<sup>a</sup>

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa* XII, 13<sup>a</sup> (Taittiriya Samhitā V, 7, 4 4<sup>b</sup>, with 110)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa* XII, 9<sup>a</sup>

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa* XII, 10<sup>a</sup>

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa* XII, 30<sup>a</sup> (Cf Atharvaveda X, 3, 3<sup>a</sup> 6<sup>a</sup>, Bloomfield, 107<sup>b</sup>)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa* XII, 15<sup>a</sup> (Taittiriya Samhitā, V, 7, 4 3<sup>a</sup>)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa* XII, 19<sup>a</sup>

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XII, 33<sup>b</sup>

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XII, 6<sup>a</sup> (Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 2<sup>a</sup>, IX, 1, 19<sup>a</sup>, with 110)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, I, 5 (Śruti Sa 12, XVII, 15, 11 dāṇya) (97<sup>a</sup>)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, I, 8 (98<sup>a</sup>)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, I, 5 (98<sup>b</sup>)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, I, 5 (98<sup>c</sup>)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8 (Cf Atharvaveda, XII, 61, 1)

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

*agnir eva vāḥaḥ svāḥa*, XI, 8

gotu afiesu yau yafab, \II, 4<sup>b</sup> (Cf gotu afiesu  
yau madhu in Atharvaveda, IX, 1, 18<sup>b</sup>)

ghritu ullupto madhumam payastan, XII, 7<sup>a</sup>,  
34<sup>a</sup> (160<sup>a</sup>)

jajendra sutrun jahi sura dasyam, XII, 11<sup>a</sup>

jahyal sapstnan t adhiat tancva, XII, 11<sup>a</sup>.

javilo jibaya badhiate, XII, 30<sup>b</sup>.

taloh ksatram balam ajat au julam, XII, 16<sup>a</sup>  
(389<sup>a</sup>)

talo dikham piyach svaritah, XII, 16<sup>a</sup> (Cf  
Taittiriya Samhita V, 7, 4 3)

tad asmai deva abhi nam namantam, XII, 16<sup>a</sup>  
(394<sup>b</sup> with namantu).

tam mayi Prajapatih, XII, 5<sup>a</sup> (Cf Atharva-  
veda, VI, 69 3<sup>b</sup>)

tam mahyati nam ahih sarvam ete XII, 1<sup>a</sup>.

tam tva sapatnakrayanama, XII, 19<sup>a</sup>

tam palyanti karayah svarandah, XII 31<sup>b</sup>

tana ma varcava tvaam, XII, 2<sup>a</sup> (Cf Atharva  
veda III, 22, 3)

tvay pranulita viaghatvann amitrin, XII, 12<sup>a</sup>

tvam rudraat ketidhih pravam uah, XII, 13<sup>a</sup>

divam yaya divas yaya, V, 15 (Cf RV, \III,  
34, 1<sup>a</sup> B reads yaya)

divam tva druhatu, XII, 5<sup>a</sup> (Cf Atharva  
veda VI, 69, 3<sup>a</sup> diva dyavi tva druhatu.)

dyavis mi lesik, IV, 7 (Cf Vajassaneyi Samhitā,  
I, 43, which has lekhih, Bloomfield, 509<sup>a</sup>)

dhanamyo dharuno dharayisauh, XII, 7<sup>b</sup>,  
34<sup>b</sup> (Cf 515<sup>a</sup>)

dhiia vidhiia paramola samirē, XII, 17<sup>a</sup>  
(From Taittiriya Samhitā, I, 7, 4 2<sup>a</sup> it  
occurs also in RV, I, 84, 2<sup>b</sup>, see Bloom  
field, 518<sup>b</sup>)

na jambhah nary asuro na yabho, XII, 23<sup>b</sup>

na piharo na gahho na si(m)umarah, XII, 28<sup>b</sup>

na mihyam ahi it na hanti siva, XII, 21<sup>b</sup>.

na vricah na tarahitarayī, XII, 28<sup>a</sup>

na tva yadami himati kimsanamam XII, 26<sup>a</sup>

na sampatantiyo(?) na vitela tasmai, XII, 24<sup>b</sup>  
na ka kiyam (?) ahnate na kalbasam krtam, XII,  
21<sup>a</sup>

na sutika taya grhetu jayate, XII, 25<sup>a</sup>.

na saiaho dhanat: na jayakriya, XII, 25<sup>a</sup>.

na hasinam krodham upait dhatim, XII, 26<sup>a</sup>

nakam et jibhavadhi tapajma, XIV, 2<sup>a</sup> (Na

nukta, I, 18<sup>a</sup>, Comm on Samplutopanisad,  
p 38 ed Burnell)

naga tva pihvapadīa bhyan, XIV, 31<sup>a</sup>

nadhite dhite vedam ahut tam apilam, XIV, 1<sup>a</sup>

nasayan mthas taya kulem jayate, XIV, 23<sup>a</sup>

n itdhe gramyia tared dvisantam, XII, 10<sup>a</sup>

nasnam alahisuk kurute nveianam, XII, 24<sup>a</sup>.

n itja tvaam himati jatatadah, XII, 21<sup>a</sup>

n itya praya dityati jayamana, XII, 23<sup>a</sup>

n ityapavada na pravi dāha grhe, XII, 24<sup>a</sup>

nasnam rakso na pāso himati, XII, 25<sup>a</sup> (Cf

Atharvaveda, I, 35, 2<sup>a</sup>)

nasnam vyagho na vrko na ahīpi, XII, 26<sup>a</sup>.

nasnam sarjo na grdukr himati XII, 27<sup>a</sup>

nasnam hrino ('har') abhi samkale, XII, 28<sup>a</sup>.

nasnam krodham manjato 'bhi yanti (?)

XII, 21<sup>a</sup>

nasnam dityo Varuno hanti dhatim, XII, 21<sup>b</sup>

nasnam framatam Varuno himati, XIII, 19<sup>a</sup>

paravarec chivam aismi hrnoti, XII, 28<sup>a</sup>

para suryat parosarah, XII, 19<sup>b</sup> (Atharva-  
veda, X, 7, 31<sup>b</sup>)

parjam tva chinnam tadhābandhanena XII, 19<sup>b</sup>.

Prajapatih paramesthi svarasah, XII, 17<sup>b</sup>.

(Cf 510<sup>a</sup>)

pramoyukam taya dvasantam ahnē, XII, 10<sup>a</sup>,

19<sup>a</sup>

rahah (rahah) sahasrauyō u, XII, 33<sup>a</sup>.

rahad dhatacy ahitam, XII, 2<sup>a</sup> (Atharvaveda,

III 22, 4<sup>a</sup>, with ahnēh)

rahmanuizaya ma, havan prtinayatā, XII,

15<sup>b</sup>

rahtram palyanta nra sadur agam, XII, 16<sup>a</sup>

(Cf 664<sup>b</sup>)

maya tad hastavarasam, XII, 3<sup>a</sup>, 4<sup>a</sup> (Atharva-  
veda, III, 22, 5<sup>a</sup>)

maya bhargu maya mahah, XII, 5<sup>a</sup> (Cf Gopatīa  
Brahmana, I, 5, 15, 16, 17, Bloomfield, 609<sup>b</sup>,  
690.)

maya yayitaye yad yafab, XII, 5<sup>b</sup>

mahiyat lu dām tri var dhanem, XII, 11<sup>a</sup>

maho vighnamā nra yanti (?) mryum XII 14<sup>a</sup>

(Cf Atharvaveda, \I 32, 3<sup>a</sup>, \VIII, 8, 21<sup>a</sup>.)

mo jib'varam dīdā(?) mī pratinidham, XII, 14<sup>a</sup>

(Cf Atharvaveda, \I, 32, 3<sup>a</sup>, \III, 8, 21<sup>a</sup>)

mī te bhavī sram ahnam, XII, 33<sup>a</sup>.

*jac ca vaca va p irata*, XII, 3<sup>a</sup> (Cf 729<sup>b</sup>)  
*jac ca hastim ahistam*, XIII 3<sup>b</sup>  
*yat te varro jatatadāḥ*, XII, 2<sup>a</sup> (Atharvaveda,  
 III, 22, 4<sup>a</sup>)  
*yathā madhumatim vīcam*, XII 6<sup>a</sup>  
*yathā sapānan samara saḥyāḥ*, XII, 32<sup>a</sup>  
*yat' aḥitu āvanayeti*, XII 4<sup>a</sup> (Cf 729<sup>b</sup>)  
*yat' Aditya tanvā sambadhāva*, XII, 1<sup>b</sup> (Cf  
 Atharvaveda III, 22, 1<sup>b</sup>)  
*yo 'rīhājā it iḥāḥarī bhadrām ānute* XIV 2<sup>a</sup>  
 (Nirukta, I, 18<sup>a</sup>, Comm on Samhitopaniś, p  
 38 ed. Burnell)  
*vyān sapātān ādharamē ca kṛvāt* XII, 7<sup>a</sup>,  
 34<sup>a</sup>  
*vāśāḥyam vāśāḥyam ādharyuḥkani (?)* X, 8  
*vānāpale śāstuvāḥ* 21 roḥa, IV, 7 (Vajrasaneyi  
 Samhitā, V, 43, also in RV III, 8 21<sup>a</sup>, &c)  
*ī itesu nas tigvājānibho 'nu m irati* XII 9<sup>a</sup>  
*ī vrica jātāt' prāṣ kura vrica*, XII 12<sup>b</sup>. (Cf  
 Egg<sup>b</sup>)  
*ī itvāg Indra bhāgub' pāṇam*, XII 15<sup>b</sup> (Cf  
 894<sup>b</sup>, 895<sup>a</sup>)  
*Vṛtrāni hātvea kuhjeto [vā] vrica*, XII, 12<sup>b</sup>  
*vedāḥ vīstamābhājanibhāmā*, XII, 19<sup>a</sup>

*śat'iyur asmaiḥ jaramā tak' prastē* XII, 22<sup>a</sup>  
*śat'ri yātomi a bhārā bhājanāni*, XII 10<sup>a</sup> (LV,  
 V, 4, 5<sup>a</sup>, Bloomfield, 916<sup>b</sup>)  
*śrīvā chātuvāsam kuruṣṭe kadhānāḥam* XIV 1<sup>a</sup>  
*śura (?) vasantāni āharato 'nu yāntu*, XII, 12<sup>a</sup>  
*sapātānam uttamāśloko astu*, XII 14<sup>a</sup>  
*sapānāḥayano vṛta*, XII 32<sup>b</sup> (970<sup>a</sup>)  
*sant' apātānam (?) madhūni i pṛyāḥ*, XII 6<sup>a</sup>  
*sahavā pṛyānāyātāḥ*, XII 31<sup>b</sup> (1004<sup>a</sup>)  
*sāhavedra dhuvātāḥ sahasvātāḥ*, XII 31<sup>b</sup>  
*śamnam śiv'īkharvānam uttamangarī* XIV 1<sup>b</sup>  
*śuśānnoḥ śakub' pṛamīḥantū enan* XII 14<sup>a</sup>  
*śuvyāni pṛyāmanāyāni*, XII, 4<sup>a</sup> (Cf Atharva  
 veda XIV, 1. 34<sup>b</sup>)  
*śuvārve goṣu yad vācāḥ* XII 3<sup>a</sup>  
*śtāmam chandaḥpāni mivādo mā āhūḥ* XII, 17<sup>a</sup>  
 (Taittiriya Samh to V, 7, 4 4<sup>a</sup> with *sto* 11,  
 which perhaps should be *stoma* 1, but see  
*J K A S*, 1909 p 430)  
*sthānūr aḥam bhārāḥ irāḥ kīl ś* XIV, 2<sup>a</sup>  
 (Nirukta I 18<sup>a</sup> Comm on Samhitopaniśad,  
 p 38 ed. Burnell)  
*śtāvārcasam pṛatkat i i śrha śvāpāḥ* XII, 1<sup>a</sup>  
 (Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1<sup>a</sup>, with *śrhad'jātāt*)

# INDEX III

PROPER NAMES, EXCLUDING THOSE OF DEITIES, FOR WHICH  
SEE INDICES IV-VI.

*Agastyah* I 2, 2

*Atraya*, II, 2, 1

*Āgastyah*, III, 2, 1, § VII, 2

*Agnividyayana*, V, 3, 3

*Arumayah*, II, 1, 4

*Āgvedī*, I, 3, 2, (acc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3,  
(gen.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3

*Āvareya*, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11

*Āvāṇharīś* III, 2, 6 (v 1 *ḥarīś*) (*Āvāṇa*  
*harīś*), § VIII, 10

*Āvāṇharayā*, III, 1, 6, 2, 2, § VII, 24,  
VIII, 2

*Āvāṇharīś* II, 2, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, V, 3, 3

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 1

*Ceroṣṭāś* (T), II, 2, 1

*Jatukarnya* V, 1, 5, 3, 3 (*Āvāṇharīś*),  
§ VIII, 10.

*Tarkīya*, III, 1, 6 (v 1 *Tarkīya*) *Tarkīya*,  
*Tarkīya* I, 5, 2 (*Tarkīya*), § VII, 29

*Dīrghatamasā* (gen.), I, 3, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, III, 1, 6, § VII, 18

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 2

*Āvāṇharīś* III, 1, 5 (*Āvāṇharīś*  
*harīś*), § VII, 15

*Āvāṇharīś*, III, 2, 3 (*Āvāṇharīś*) § VIII, 3, 4

*Bharadvajā*, I, 2, 1, 4, 2, II, 2, 1; *Āvāṇharīś*  
*harīś*, V, 2, 2, *Bharadvāja*, II,  
2, 4

*Bharadvāja*, I, 2, 2; (acc.) I, 2, 2

*Madhuchandah*, I, 1, 3, (gen.) I, 1, 3; *Ma*  
*dhuchandastam*, I, 1, 3

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1

*Āvāṇharīś*, III, 2, 2, (*Āvāṇharīś*), § VII, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, III, 1, 1, *Āvāṇharīś*,  
III, 1, 1, § VII, 2, *Āvāṇharīś* (acc.  
masc.), III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 1, 3, (acc.) I, 1, 3

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 1

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 3, 2, (acc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3,  
(gen.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3

*Āvāṇharīś* (T), II, 2, 1

*Āvāṇharīś* (T), II, 2, 1

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 4, 2, 3, 2, II, 2, 2; 4, *Āvāṇharīś*  
*harīś*, V, 2, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 2, 2, *Āvāṇharīś*, I, 2, 2, (nom.)  
§ I, 3

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 2, 3, § I, 2, *Āvāṇharīś*, § I, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 5, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 2, 2, § I, 3, (acc.) § I, 3,  
*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 2, 2

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 1, § VII, 4, I,  
2, (voc.) § I, 6, *Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 3,

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 4

*Āvāṇharīś*, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 3

*Āvāṇharīś*, II, 2, 1





## INDEX IV

### WORDS OCCURRING IN VERSES OTHER THAN RGVEDIC, NIVIDS, PRAISAS, ETC

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified  
Words are given in their forms as found. Prefixes are connected with the verb, unless words  
intervene.)

#### A In Astaveya Āraṇyaka and parallel passages in Śūkhayana Āraṇyaka.

- dhṛitam*, V, 3, 2  
*agula*, V, 1, 1, *agnā* 3, IV, 1  
*agnyākodā*, V, 1, 1  
*diti* (with acc.) IV, 1, V, 2, 1  
*atichandasa*, V, 1, 4  
*adruah*, IV, 1  
*dhāvayāh*, IV, 1  
*dhāryāh*, V, 2, 1 (prob. w. r. for *dhāryā*)  
*dnm* (with acc.), IV, 1, V, 1, 1  
*dnial*, V, 3, 2  
*antarekṣam*, V, 1, 1  
*annam*, V, 1, 1  
*annasubhā* (f), V, 3, 2  
*anydin*, IV, 1  
*āpareṇitam* (acc.), IV, 1  
*āpanam*, V, 1, 4, *āpanaya*, V, 1, 4  
*āpāram*, V, 1, 1  
*āprativadāh*, V, 3, 2  
*abhiyasm* (acc. neut.), V, 3, 2  
*abhiśubhā*, IV, 1  
*anum*, V, 1, 5  
*dnurkiah*, V, 2, 2  
*antiam*, V, 3, 1, (acc.) ib. (gen.) ib.  
*aydaktaram* (nom. or acc. neut.), V, 3, 2  
*arkdm*, V, 2, 2, *drakāh*, V, 2, 2 (perhaps w. r.  
 for *surakāh*)  
*ārc* *arcanti*, V, 2, 2  
*arcā*, V, 3, 2  
*āsv* *avata*, *avataṁ*, *avantu*, V, 1, 1, *avut*,  
 V, 1, 1  
*avratām* (acc. masc.), V, 2, 2  
*āst* *ast*, V, 1, 5, 2, 2, 3, 2, *āst*, V, 2, 2,  
*astu*, I, 3, 4  
*āst* *astanyate* (f *astanyate*), II, 1  
*astm*, V, 1, 1, 5, 5, I, 7, *astmasu*, I, 4, 3  
*astar*, V, 1, 1  
*āt*, IV, 1, (with loc.) V, 2, 1  
*atma*, V, 1, 2, (instr.) V, 1, 3  
*adityāh*, V, 1, 1, 4, 5, I, 7  
*annasubhāsa*, V, 1, 4, 5, I, 7  
*āp* *apṛyasm*, V, 3, 2 (the ref. to *āpṛyasm* is  
 corrected in Whitney, *Roots*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 248,  
 249), *anapṛyasm*, V, 1, 2  
*apāh*, V, 1, 1  
*abhih*, IV, 1  
*aydānam*, V, 3, 2  
*āyuk* (acc.), V, 3, 2  
*ardhas* (f), V, 2, 1 (perhaps w. r. for *ardhas* (f))  
*āst* *imake*, V, 2, 2, *akā*, V, 1, 1, *āst*, IV, 1  
*ām*, V, 2, 2  
*astm*, V, 1, 2, 2, 1, (acc.) V, 1, 1, 2, 2  
*asth*, V, 2, 1  
*Indrak*, IV, 1, V, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, 1, 2, (acc.)  
 V, 1, 2, V, 2, 2, (dat.) V, 2, 2, (gen.) V, 2,  
 1, (voc.) V, 2, 2, with *pluti* V, 1, 2  
*Indrajyotiṣam*, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious)  
*astam*, V, 1, 1, 5, *astam*, V, 1, 5  
*ast*, V, 1, 1  
*astam*, V, 2, 2, *ast* IV, 1  
*ast*, III, 2, 5, V, 2, 2, 3, 2  
*āst* *anuprenkhasva*, *anuprenkhasva*, *an-*  
*uprenkhasva*, V, 2, 4  
*im*, V, 2, 3  
*āst* *astanyate*, I, 3, 4  
*āst* *ile*, IV, 1, *ile*, V, 2, 2, *ile*, III, 2, 5



na, V, 2, 1; 2, (of comparison) III, 2, 5 (dub , see nakulī)  
 nāh (acc.), IV, 1; (dat.) V, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2;  
 (gen.) IV, 1, V, 2, 1.  
 nakulī (?), III, 2, 5.  
 naksatrah, V, 1, 1.  
 namah V, 1, 1  
 natyam (m or n), IV, 1  
 √na abhi naya, IV, 2, *supra* III, V, 2, 2  
 (dubious use and accent)  
 nandm IV, 1, V, 2, 2  
 nr̥tamah, V, 2, 2  
 netāram, V, 2, 1.  
 pakrah, V, 1, 2  
 √pat patiyantim, V, 1, 5  
 patib, V, 2, 1, (voc.) IV, 1.  
 paulm, V, 2, 2  
 pīrah, V, 3, 2  
 paravāntīh, V, 2, 1  
 pavib, III, 2, 5  
 patiū, V, 1, 2  
 pai klena, V, 1, 4  
 pūdrah, V, 1, 1  
 √piu pinvati, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious)  
 √pih piba, IV, 1, pīha, V, 1, 1  
 pūdgasandīram, V, 2, 1 (v l \*sadyam)  
 pūvarim, V, 2, 2  
 pūcham, V, 1, 2  
 pūnarbhīh, V, 1, 1, \*bhuvah, V, 2, 1.  
 pūv, V, 2, 1, 2  
 pūrvodram, V, 2, 2  
 pu nvaio, IV, 1  
 √pu pūnyanti, V, 2, 2  
 pūritā, IV, 1  
 pūrvam (nom neut), V, 3, 2, (gen masc)  
 IV, 1  
 pūrvandm, IV, 1  
 pūrvikūtam, V, 1, 1  
 Pūś, V, 1, 1, Pūś 3m, IV, 1  
 √pr par at, IV, 1.  
 prīhau, V, 1, 1  
 prīhnyupardm, V, 3, 2 (accent and reading  
 dubious).  
 Prīnmatarah, V, 1, 1  
 prakid, V, 2, 2 (v l uprakid)  
 prā itama, IV, 1  
 prayām, V, 3, 2  
 Prayipatib, V, 3, 2

prati (with acc.), V, 2, 1.  
 prāyish, V, 1, 2; 3, 2  
 prābhūh, V, 1, 1 (v l prābhūh); (voc) IV, 1.  
 prābhūh (v. l. prābhūh), V, 1, 1.  
 prāstāha, V, 2, 2 (more prob pra + √stāh).  
 prāndh, V, 1, 5, 3, 2; (acc) V, 1, 4, 3, 2,  
 (dat) V, 1, 4, 3, 2, (gen.) V, 3, 2  
 prayah, V, 2, 1  
 bahm (acc.), V, 1, 5; (abl) V, 1, 5, Ś I, 8  
 bhāhatma, V, 1, 4  
 bhr̥dt, IV, 1, V, 2, 2; bhr̥ate (name of Saman),  
 V, 1, 2  
 Br̥hāspatib, V, 1, 1.  
 br̥dhma, V, 1, 1, (acc) V, 3, 2, (voc.) V, 3, 2.  
 br̥hmanavartaidm (acc.), V, 3, 2  
 br̥hmandhārtīram (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2  
 (accent dubious)  
 √bru san-bravatyahai, IV, 1.  
 bhagah, V, 1, 5  
 bhadr̥ya (name of Saman), V, 1, 2  
 bhargah, V, 1, 5  
 bhūktāh, V, 1, 5  
 bhūyah, V, 1, 5  
 bhavah (undecl.), V, 1, 4, 3, 2  
 √bhu bhuvah, IV, 1, bhūyām, V, 1, 2, bhū-  
 idm (acc. neut.), V, 1, 1, bhūteśhyah (dat.),  
 V, 1, 4, 2 bhūtam (nom neut.), V, 3, 2  
 bhūtyah, V, 3, 2  
 bhūyah (acc.), V, 1, 5, Ś I, 8  
 bhūh (undecl.), V, 1, 4, 3, 2  
 √bhū bhūra, V, 2, 2  
 bhūryam, V, 3, 4  
 bhūktīh, IV, 1, V, 2, 2; 2, (voc) IV, 1  
 bhūktāh, V, 2, 2, (dat) V, 2, 1  
 bhūktāh, IV, 1, bhūktāh, IV, 1.  
 √mā matva, IV, 1, matva, V, 1, 1.  
 madam, V, 2, 1.  
 madhu V, 1, 1  
 mānūmat, V, 2, 2  
 √man manuyya, IV, 1 (accent dubious)  
 māh, V, 1, 1, (gen) 3, 2, (instr) V, 1, 5,  
 (abl) 3, 2  
 mānyāc, IV, 1.  
 mānyāc, V, 1, 1  
 Mārātāh, V, 1, 1  
 √māh māhā māh, V, 2, 1  
 māhā, V, 1, 5, māhā, V, 3, 2, māhā, V, 3, 2





*alaksanah*, XII, 24

*alardah*, XII, 19 (of doubtful form and meaning, cf perhaps *avata* (*Lex*), *avata* (AV) but perhaps it may be from *alr* (cf *alarka*, RV, VIII, 48, 8), for *alr* *la* (like *vanā la*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p 442 Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 120, n 5), the tensils becoming a media (cf Macdonell, p 32) and meaning 'active one' Or *alaya*?)

*alav* *avata*, VII, 1, A II, 7.

*alal* *alata*, XII, 21, XIV, 2

*alal* *aliya* XI, 8, *alala*, XII, 24 (doubtful, the MS reading is *niyāṣṭarām lalāmah pralīsthaḥ*, and I amend to a *ala* to give sense and metre)

*alima*, XI, 8

*alima*, XII, 4

*aliman* XII, 33

*alav* *ali*, XII 33; *alav* VII, 1, XII, 15;

A II, 7, *alal*, A II 7

*alav* XIV, 1, *alim*, XII, 18

*aluraḥ*, XII 25

*alam*, XII 35

*alavatraṇ*, VII, 1, A II, 7.

*alalāḥ* XI, 5, 6, *ali*, A II 7

*alichandarena* XI, 8

*alim*, XI, 6 (loc) XI, 5, 6

*aliditāḥ*, XII 1

*alutubhena* XI 8

*alal* XI 5, 6

*alal* (acc) XI, 8

*alutubh* XI 8

*alolakaḥ* § 1, 7

*alav*, VII, 1, A II 7 (*alav*, in second case)

*alal*, XII, 20, 29, XIV, 2

*al* *ali*, XIV, 2, *pralī* XII 2 *alalite*

XIV, 1, *alalita*, XIV, 2, *alalita* (neut),

VII, 1, A II 7, *alav*, XII 15

*alal* XI, 5, 6 XII, 9, 10, 30, (voc.) XII, 31

*alav* XII, 15

*alav*, XII 20-29

*al* XI, 8, XII, 9 10, 29

*alav* VII 1, IX, 1, A II, 7

*al*, XII, 15

*alal* *preukhoyam* I, 7

*alal*, XI, 5, 6

*alal* *alal*, XII, 15,

*alav* (acc), XIV, 1

*alal*, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

*alal*, XII, 12

*alal* (abl), XII, 19

*al*, XIV, 1

*al* (acc), VII, 1, A II, 7. (3 nom) VII,

1, A II, 7

*al*, XII, 30, *al*, XII, 16

*al*, XII, 15; 29. (The older form is *al*, and this may best be read here)

*al*, XII, 16

*al*, XI, 8

*al*, XII, 9.

*al*, XII, 14 Cf *Inl Stud*, VIII, 264, n

*al* (acc), XIV, 1

*al*, XII, 32

*al*, XI 8

*al*, XII, 10, XIV, 2

*al* XII 21

*al*, XII 11

*al*, XII 23

*al*, XII, 29, XIV, 1, *al*, XII,

28, *al*, XII, 2, *al*, XII, 7, 54,

*al*, XII, 16

*al* (abl), XII, 28

*al*, XII, 20

*al*, XII, 21, 26.

*al*, XII, 16

*al* *al* (3rd SS 'an), presumably a plural form of the imperfect of *al* as a second class verb (cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, 15 845, 622, but if so a late form. The other texts have *al*), XII, 16 *al*, XII, 32 (in both cases probably with true nonst effect)

*al*, XI, 8

*al*, XII 24 *al*, XII, 15

*al*, XII, 8 4

*al* *al*, XI 8, (acc) XI, 8

*al*, XII, 28

*al*, XII, 7, 34

*al*, VII, 1, IX, 1, A II, 7, XI, 6, (loc)

XI, 5, 6

*candramah*, XI, 5; 6

*chandama* (acc.), XII, 17; *chandasa*, XI, 8.  
*chad chaltu*, XIV, 1; *chinmam*, XII, 29

*cham jayale*, XII, 23; 25; *chamanda*, XII, 23, *jaleh*, XII, 19, *jalam*, XII, 16 (nom. nom.).

*cham*, XII, 6

*chamdhakal*, XII, 25 (cf. Vajrasaneyi Samhitā, XX, 6, 6c.)

*chamdhakal*, XII, 25

*chamena*, XI, 8.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28

*chamdhakal*, XII, 30 (cf. Uṇḍi Sutra, IV, 95; 96 presumably it denotes some special shrub or tree)

*cham jaya*, XII, 11, and II, 17 (j)

*cham*, XII, 30

*cham anu jivatha*, XII, 18.

*cham jivatha*, XII, 13.

*cham vijayanti*, XIV, 2.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 30

*chamdhakal*, VII, 1, IX, 1, A. II, 7

*cham*, XII, 19, *chad* (nom.), XII, 3; 4, (acc.) XII, 4, *cham* (acc.), XII, 20; 29.

*chamdhakal* (abl.), XII, 2.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 9

*chamdhakal*, XII, 28 (reading doubtful the MS B has *chamdhakal* which would easily give *chamdhakal* na vij: if *chamdhakal* could mean 'animal' and if *chamdhakal* were naturally introduced here (cf p 161) But *chamdhakal* = snake occurs several times in the Aitareya Veda (e g III, 27, 28) and the temptation to read *chamdhakal* or *chamdhakal* (as a parallel form) is very great)

*chamdhakal*, XI, 8.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 25

*chamdhakal*, XI, 8.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 23

*chamdhakal*, XII, 13, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100

*chamdhakal*, XII, 13 (The usual form is *chamdhakal*, Parina, III, 2, 182, and Gṛha)

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, VII, 1; IX, 1, A. II, 7.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 11.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 1.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 21.

*chamdhakal*, XI, 5; 6.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 16; *chamdhakal*, VII, 1, IX, 1; A. II, 7

*chamdhakal*, XII, 20 (v. 1 = 'giver'; cf RV, I, 23, 32; VI, 35, 5, where occurs *chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, and Aitareya Aranyaka, V, 2, 1, n. 4).

*chamdhakal*, XII, 23.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 23.

*chamdhakal*, I, 5; (nom. plur.) VII, 17; (gen.) XI, 8; (dat.) VII, 1; A. II, 7.

*chamdhakal*, I, 5.

*chamdhakal*, IX, 7; *chamdhakal*, XI, 18, XII, 5, (loc) 18.

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, XII, 20, 29, *chamdhakal* (acc.), XII, 31.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 26.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 7, 34

*chamdhakal*, XII, 7; 34

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, A. II, 7, *chamdhakal*, I, 5 (here it means 'has united', not a mere past The use is remarkable cf. *chamdhakal* *chamdhakal* in VI, 3, where the Aitareya version has the correct *chamdhakal*), *chamdhakal*, XII, 2; 3

*chamdhakal*, XII, 17.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 7, 34.

*chamdhakal*, see *chamdhakal*.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 9

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, XII, 16, 17.

*chamdhakal*, VII, 1, A. II, 7

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, XII, 33

*chamdhakal* (acc.), XIV, 2.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 31

*chamdhakal* (acc.), XII, 17

*chamdhakal* (acc.), XII, 24

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, XII, 9, *chamdhakal*, XII, 11; 29, *chamdhakal*, XII, 12; see *chamdhakal*.

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, XII, 15.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 6

*chamdhakal*, XII, 7, 34.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 17

*chamdhakal*, XII, 15, 17.

*chamdhakal*, XI, 5; 6.

*chamdhakal* *chamdhakal*, XII, 3, *chamdhakal*, XII, 16

*chamdhakal*, I, 8.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 12; 18.

*chamdhakal*, XII, 23

*chamdhakal*, XII, 28

*chamdhakal*, XII, 13



- pitacāḥ*, XII, 25  
*putra* (with abl.), XII, 29  
*putra*, XII, 9  
*putraḥ* (acc.), XII, 10  
*putram*, XII, 29  
*√pu putrapanuyam* XII, 4  
*putrapādūbhāyam* (1° padābhāyam), XII, 31  
*putanah*, XII, 20  
*putanayataḥ* (acc.), XII, 31.  
*putanyataḥ* (gen.), XII, 15, (acc.) XII, 31  
*puthivī* XI, 5, 6  
*puthukā*, XII, 27  
*putya* XII, 23  
*Putraputah*, I, 7 B, XI, 8, XII, 17  
*putrastham* XII, 14  
*putrasarūḥ*, XII, 30  
*√putrāḥ putrakalam*, XII, 3.  
*putrayanikam* XII, 20, 29  
*putradāhah* (†MS *putradāhā*), XII, 29  
*putrah*, XII, 6, (loc.) XII, 5, 6  
*√padāḥ padāhyate*, XII, 30.  
*padāhanama* XII 29  
*palam*, XI, 6, XII, 16, (loc.) XI, 5, 6  
*palakama* XI, 8  
*palakā* XII, 33 (v 1)  
*palak* XII 2  
*palakavayāḥ*, XII, 1  
*Palakavayāḥ* XI, 8  
*palakam*, XII, 20-29, *palakāḥ*, 27, 33 (v 1)  
*palakam* I, 5, XI, 6, 8  
*palakamantitaya* (masc.), XII 25  
*palakamaya* I 5  
*palanguḥ* XII, 14  
*palakam* (acc. neut.) XII, 16, XIV, 2  
*palargah* XII, 5, VII, 1, A II, 7  
*palatū* XII, 33  
*palakakaraḥ*, XIV 2  
*√palāḥ palāyam*, XII, 21.  
*palāyam* (f), XII, 26  
*√palāḥ palāyati* XII, 2 *palāyam* VII, 1, A II, 7, *palāyadāyam*, XII, 1, *palāy* XIV, 2 (*palāyati* *pac* *avasi* *avasi*), *palāy* (unpunct.) VII 1, A II, 7  
*√palāḥ palāyati*, XII, 20-29, *palāy*, XII, 10, *palāy*, XII, 9  
*palāyanti* (acc.), XII, 10  
*palakarah* XII, 22  
*palakatan*, XII, 15  
*palakāḥ*, XII, 30, 32, (acc.) XII, 20-29, (loc.) XII, 33  
*√palāḥ palakam*, XII, 29  
*palakam*, XII, 6  
*palakamam*, XII, 6; *palakamam* XII, 7, 34  
*palakam*, XII, 12  
*√palāḥ palakam*, XII, 12  
*palakāḥ*, VII, 1, XI, 1, 6, A II, 7; (loc.) VII 12, XI, 5, 6, A II, 7  
*palakam*, XII, 30  
*palakavayāḥ*, VII, 1, A II 7  
*palakavayāḥ*, VII, 1, A II, 7  
*palakāḥ*, XI, 6, (loc.) XI, 5, 6, *palakāḥ*, XII 21  
*palakāḥ*, XII, 3, 4, 5, VII, 1  
*palakāḥ*, XII, 12  
*√palāḥ palakam*, XII, 6 (doubtful read ng perhaps imperative (Watney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 618) the sense may be, 'may the *palakāḥ* gladden me with honey meat, O Agni,' but I read *palakam*)  
*palakāḥ*, XII 5, 14 (if so read, the sense must be 'hindering their greatness', but the other version, *palakāḥ*, is better)  
*palakāḥ* I, 5, *palakāḥ* (neut.), XII, 7, 34, *palakāḥ*, I 5  
*palakamam* XII, 13  
*palakāḥ* (f), XII, 14; *palakam*, XI, 6, 8  
*palakam*, XII, 33, *palakāḥ* (f) IX, 7, *palakam* (f) VII 1, A II 7, *palakāḥ*, VII, 1, IX, 1 A II, 7, *palakāḥ*, A II, 7  
*palakam* XII, 22  
*palakāḥ* XII 23, 14 (f)  
*√palāḥ palakam*, XII, 22  
*palakamam*, XIV, 2.  
*palakam*, XI, 6 XII, 15, (acc.) XII, 1, (loc.) XI, 5, 6  
*√palāḥ palakam*, XI 6, 8  
*√palāḥ palakam*, XII, 9  
*palakam*, XII, 14  
*palakāḥ* XII, 10  
*palakāḥ* *palakam*, XII, 4  
*palakāḥ*, I, A II, 7.  
*palakāḥ*, XII, 25  
*palakam* XIV, 1  
*palakam*, XII 5  
*palakāḥ* *palakam*, XII, 6, 1. *palakāḥ*, XII, 5.  
*palakāḥ*, XII, 2, 3.  
*palakāḥ*, XII 4, 5, *palakāḥ*, XII, 15.

yajastva, XII, 15

✓yā annyaśu, XII, 12, abhiyānti (abhi-  
iānti B, which can hardly be right), XII, 21,  
upayānti (jati B), XII, 24

rakṣa, XII, 25

rajaśam, XI, 8

✓rabh i anuramrabhauṣaṇ, XII, 18

rāśīram (acc), XII, 17

✓ris vīram, XII, 33, vīraśam, XII, 13

✓ruy vī ruroja, XII, 30, rujan XII, 7, 34

rudraś, XII, 13

✓ruś āroha, XII, 7, 34, iroha I, 7,  
dṛoḥa I, 7 Cf abhyarūḥam, X, 8

reśa, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

roḥoḥyam X, 8 (Cf Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sutra,  
VIII, 28, 3)

✓rup ulluṣṭaś, XII, 7, 34

lohau, XI, 8

✓vad avadūmi, XII, 6, vadīyami, VII, 1,  
A II, 7

vana (acc) XII, 11.

vanaiśate IX, 7

Vartuś XII, 21, 29

varcas, XII, 2, 3, (instr) XII, 2.

varcarīnam XII, 2

varīhanīu XII, 13

✓vas vīram XI, 8, saprasam VII, 1, \*ā-  
dhanā, A II, 7

✓vaumati XIII, 1 (not in Chandogya Upan-  
iṣad, III, 11, 6 and from Jacob's *Concordance*  
apparently fore gn to the Upaniṣads)

✓vāś avāśa XII, 15

vī XII, 3

vuk VII, 1, XI, 6, A II, 7, (acc) XII, 6 (in-  
str) XII, 3 (loc) XI, 5, 6, V II, 1, A II, 7

vakṣīram VII, 1, A II, 7

vakhyam (acc) XII, 20

valīu XII, 9

vajuh XI, 3, 6

vajīnam (acc) XII, 18

✓vad vīda, XII, 19

vidyūśa XI, 5, 6

vidhatī XII, 17

vīśamābhāyamābhānam, XII, 19 (the read ug  
seems certain)

vīśaś(?) XII, 15

vīśaś, XII, 25

✓vīś i abhyārtadīvam, XII, 18

īytram, XII, 9-11, 30.

vyākṣaś, XII, 28

vyaś, XII, 32

vedam, XIV, 1, 2, (gen) A, II, 7, iśad  
mātarīnī (7), V II, 1

vedrīyena (so rather than *ryena*), XI, 8

vyaghraś, XII, 26

vyoma, VII, 2, A, II, 7 (error for *yuyoma*)

✓vraś am, vi, pra, praś vīśa, XII, 18  
(exact readings are doubtful)

śalavāś IX, 7

śaiyuk, XII, 23

śatrum, XII, 11

śatrūyāśam, XII, 10

śaptamā, VII, 1; A, II, 7

✓śap śaptam, XII, 21 (śapam A, B)

śarīram, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

śatī, XII, 18

śapit, XII, 11, 19

śiraś (acc) XIV, 1.

śivam (acc neut.), XII, 28

śi nīśmarāś, X, 11

śura, XII, 11, 13

śrutam, A, II, 7

śrutiś, VII, 1, IX, 1, A, II, 7

śrīram, XI, 6, (loc) XI, 5, 6

śvopadam, XII, 26

śokalam (acc neut.), XIV, 2

śajam (nom) XI, 8, (acc) VII, 1, A, II, 7

śalyasapīdhaś, VII, 17

✓śad upaduk, XII, 16

sandak, XII, 17

sandak, VII, 1, A, II, 7 (w r for \*śa)

sapīnakṣayanaś, XII, 31, (acc) XII, 19

sapīdan, XII, 7, 32, 34, &c.

samara, XII, 32

śarīpallapaś, XII, 24 (śa - na must be merely  
a strong negative since *śarīpād* hardly can  
be taken as \*misfortune; I read \*śatantyo)

Sarasvatī, VII, 1, A, II, 7

śarīś, XII, 27

śarīśandāsana, XI, 8

śarīram (acc v l śarī), XII, 1, śarī, XII, 18

śarīśaś, XII, 32

✓śaś śaśa, śaśatva, XII, 31, śaśīnāś, XII,  
32, śaśīśa, XII, 30 (śaśa might be = śaśa,  
but this is unlikely)

- śāha* (with instr.), XII, 29  
*śāhastauryaś*, XII, 33  
*śāha*, XII, 9  
*śamnan*, XIV, 1  
*śamrajyena*, XI, 8  
*śamghena*, XII, 6  
*Śaviraś* (I), XI, 8  
*śam*, XI, 8  
*śafarnaś*, XII, 14  
*śamghāḥ*, VII, 1, A II, 7  
*śarayaś*, XII, 4  
*śarvarāś*, XII, 17  
*śarvarman*, XI, 8, (loc.) XII, 3  
*śafiraś*, XII, 25  
*śatram*, XI, 8, XII, 33  
*śarayaś*, XII, 19, *śaryaś*, VII, 1, IX, 1, A II, 7  
*śarvaśarvataś*, XII, 18  
*śatlagāś* (MSS *śat*), XII, 23  
*śamghāḥ*, XII, 7, 34  
*śamnam*, XII, 17  
*śat*: *śāhastauryaś*, XII, 31 *śatśatśat*, °ś,  
*śat*, XII, 1, 5 and 6 *śatśatśat*, VII, 1,  
A II, 7, °śat, VII, 1, A II, 7  
*śikṣaś*, XIV, 1  
*śikṣaś*, XI, 8  
*śikṣaś*, XII, 11  
*śikṣaś*, XII, 16, 31  
*śikṣaś*, XI, 8  
*śikṣaś*, XII, 21, *śikṣaś*, XII, 28,  
*śikṣaś*, XII, 30, *śikṣaś*, XII, 11 *śikṣaś*, XII,  
11, *śikṣaś*, XII, 10, *śikṣaś*, XII, 14  
(Boughananaś which with *śikṣaś* and *śarayaś*  
might conceivably = 'the might of persons at  
variance (a gen. in *śat*) goes to destruction'  
but the *śat* must be wrong)  
*śikṣaś*, XII, 26, *śikṣaś*, XII, 3  
*śikṣaś*, XII, 1 &c  
*śikṣaś* *śarayaś* (I), XII, 11, *śikṣaś*, A II,  
7  
*śikṣaś* *śamnam*, XII, 25, 27, *śikṣaś* (*śikṣaś*  
*śamnam*), XII, 22, 26, *śikṣaś*, VII, 1, IX,  
1, 7 A II, 7  
*śikṣaś*, XII, 4  
*śikṣaś*, XI, 6, (loc.) XII, 6  
*śikṣaś*, XI, 13

## INDEX V

### WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRAṆYAKAS I-III, OTHER THAN WORDS OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified. See also p. 344. As II 2 and 6 have no *ābanda*s, the II is repeated where necessary to avoid ambiguity. Parallel words in the Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka I, II, \ III are referred to as Ś.)

- aś* II, 2, 2.  
*antaphalākam*, I, 2 2.  
*āharaś*, II, 3, 6, III, 2, 3, Ś \ III, 3.  
*ākṛimāḥ*, II, 1, 5.  
*akṣa vna*, II 2, 2, 1, 8, III, 1, 5, (acc.) II, 3, 8, (acc. du.) III, 1 3, Ś VII 10, (nom. plur.) I, 3 4, 7, (acc. plur.) III, 2, 2; Ś VIII, 2, (instr. plur.) I, 3, 8, (gen. plur.) II, 1, 4, 3, 8, III, 2, 2, Ś VIII, 2, (loc.) Ś VIII, 4.  
*akṣarasamīpanaś*, III, 2, 2, Ś VIII, 5, (acc.) III, 2, 1, Ś \ III, 5.  
*akṣini*, II, 4, 1, (acc.) II, 4, 2, III, 2, 4, Ś \ III, 7, (abl. with *ī*) II, 4, 1.  
*akṣaś*, I, 2, 2 (collar-bone). Cf *akṣom* and *akṣaś*, Ś II, 4 (also in the Bodleian MS).  
*agnāś*, I, 4, 1, 2, II, 2, 1, 5, 7, 4, 1, 3, III, 1, 2, Ś VII, 1, &c., (acc.) I, 1 2, II, 1, 1, III, 2, 4, Ś \ III, 6, (gen.) I, 3, 8, II, 1, 7, III, 2, 4, 5, (loc.) III, 2, 3, Ś \ III, 4, (abl.) Ś \ II, 8.  
*agnihotram*, II, 3, 3, Ś X, 1, 8, (acc.) Ś X, 8.  
*agram*, I, 3, 3, 4, 1.  
*agra*, II, 4 1, III, 2, 1, 3, Ś \ II, 2, (with abl.) II, 5.  
*agṇyaś*, I, 1 5.  
*āgam*, II, 5, (nom. plur.) I, 2, 2, (abl. plur.) II, 5, (gen. plur.) I, 4, 1, II, 3, 5, *ya* *akṣaś* *nr*, Ś I, 5.  
*angulayāś*, I, 1, 2, 2, 2, III, 2, 5, Ś \ III 9.  
*angulīś*, Ś II, 5.  
*āśoc* *prat* *arjantī*, I, 4, 1.  
*āśay* *vyayama* *nr*, II, 3, 6.  
*anākaram*, III, 2, 6 (*rite* *nākaram*, Ś \ III, 11).  
*anfan*, II, 4 1. Cf *anda*.  
*anśayint*, II, 6.  
*ataś*, I, 3, 4, 4 2, II, 1, 2, III, 2, 4, Ś \ III, 7.  
*ate* (with acc.), II, 3, 3, Ś I, 4.  
*atithik*, I, 1, 1.  
*atithymene*, III, 1, 3, Ś \ II, 8, 9.  
*atta*, II, 1, 2.  
*atru*, II, 1, 2.  
*atrayam*, II, 1, 1.  
*atra*, I, 3, 8, 4 1, 5 1, II, 5, III, 1, 1, Ś VII, 2, &c.  
*atha*, I, 1, 1, &c., Ś \ II, 2, &c.; *atha* *karmat*, I, 2, 2, 5, 2, *atha* *kaś*, II, 4, 3, *athat* *ik*, I, 4, 1, II, 2, 2, 7, III, 1, 2; 3, 6, 2, 5.  
*atho*, I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4 2, 5, 1, II, 1, 6, 3, 6.  
*ād* *atta*, II, 1, 2, 3, 1, *ādanti*, II, 3, 1.  
*āḥṛit*, *āḥṛaś*, II, 1, 2, *ādama*, II, 4 2, *āḥṛaś*, *āḥṛa*, II, 1, 2.  
*Aditiś*, III, 1, 6, Ś \ II, 15, *Aditi* *apṛiṣṭā*, Ś \ II, 15.  
*addhataman*, I, 2, 3.  
*adhastat*, II, 4, 1.  
*adhi* (with acc. and *āśoc*), II, 1, 1 (with loc.) II, 3, 8 (a *śloka*), (with loc. and *āśoc*) II, 1, 1.

- adhi lai valam*, I, 3, 3; 8; II, 1, 2, &c., § VII, 2, &c.  
*adhipatsh*, II, 3, 7, (acc) II, 3, 7  
*adhyatnam*, I, 3, 3, II, 1, 2, &c.; §, \ II, 2, &c.  
*adhyañam*, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11.  
*adhivaryatsh*, III, 1, 3, § VIII, 4  
*adhu samantam*, II, 1, 2, *adhipramitam*,  
*adhipramitam*, II, 4, 3; *adhipramya*, II, 4, 3.  
*adhamamantam*, II, 3, 8.  
*adhamantam*, III, 2, 6.  
*aduruktah*, see *adur*  
*adurukh*, I, 5, 1.  
*adurukh*, II, 1, 5  
*adur* (with acc.), I, 4, 1, II, 1, 2, 7, 3, 1, 3;  
 (adv) II, 1, 7.  
*adurukh*, see *adur*  
*adurukh*, III, 2, 3; § VII, 4  
*adurukh* (v 1), II, 3, 1  
*adurukh*, III, 1, 4, § VII, 8  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 1, &c., (acc) I, 1, 2, &c., (nom  
 plur) II, 1, 5, § I, 2, (loc plur) II, 1, 5.  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 2, *adurukh*, I, 1, 2, *adurukh*,  
 I, 1, 1, *adurukh*, II, 3, 6, *adurukh*,  
 II, 3, 5  
*adurukh*, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 2  
*adurukh*, II, 3, 6, (acc) II, 3, 6  
*adurukh*, III, 1, 5  
*adurukh*, I, 5, 2, 3  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 2, &c., § II 10, &c.  
*adurukh* (with loc.), I, 5, 1, § II, 11  
*adurukh*, III, 2, 4 (adurukh, § VII, 1)  
*adurukh*, II, 1, 2, &c., (acc) II, 1, 2, &c.,  
 § VII, 10, (gen) II, 1, 7, III, 2, 5, § VIII,  
 8, (loc) III, 1, 2, § VII, 3  
*adurukh*, I, 2, 3, 4, 3, (acc.) I, 4, 3;  
 II, 3, 3, (loc) I, 4, 3  
*adurukh*, III, 1, 2, § VII, 10  
*adurukh*, I, 3, 5  
*adurukh* (with acc.) I, 2, 3, 5, 2; III, 1, 2,  
 5, § VII, 11, 12, (with gen.) § VII, 3  
*adurukh*, I, 5, 1  
*adurukh*, II, 2, 1 (adurukh, § VII, 1)  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 3, &c., § XI, 7, (acc) I, 2, 4,  
 II, 4, 2, (instr) II, 1, 2, III, 2, 4, (gen)  
 II, 1, 2, 4, 3; (loc) II, 3, 1, (nom plur)  
 II, 3, 1, *adurukh*, I, 4, 1.  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 3  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 2; II, 3, 1; (nom neut) II, 3,  
 1; (acc masc) II, 1, 2, 3, 1; (nom 1st)  
 II, 3, 1, *adurukh*, I, 2, 4  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 2; 3, 3, § I, 7, (acc) I, 1, 2,  
 2, 4, II, 1, 7, (dat) I, 4, 2, (gen) I, 1, 4,  
 2, 3; 3, 8, § I, 7, (gen plur) I, 4, 1  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 2; II, 1, 2; § VII, 10  
*adurukh*, II, 4, 1  
*adurukh* (with abl), I, 2, 2; *adurukh*, I, 3, 2,  
*adurukh*, II, 3, 2, III, 2, 1, *adurukh*, II, 4, 3,  
 (with abl) III, 1, 3, § VII, 8, 9, *adurukh*,  
 (neut), III, 2, 4, *adurukh*, § XI, 8, *adurukh*,  
 (neut), I, 3, 2, *adurukh*, III, 1, 1; § VIII,  
 1, *adurukh* (acc), III, 2, 3, *adurukh*, II, 1,  
 4; *adurukh*, III, 2, 1  
*adurukh*, II, 3, 7; III, 1, 6, § VII, 18.  
*adurukh*, I, 2, 4, *adurukh*, I, 2, 4  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 4, 4, 3, *adurukh*, I, 4, 2,  
*adurukh*, see *adurukh*  
*adurukh*, I, 2, 2 (probably *adurukh*, ablative,  
 or perhaps *adurukh*, dative)  
*adurukh*, I, 1, 4  
*adurukh*, II, 1, 5, 2, 1, 3, 3; 4, 1, 1, § X, 8,  
 (instr) II, 1, 8, 4, 3, (gen) III, 2, 5, §  
 VII, 8, (loc) § XI, 1  
*adurukh*, II, 3, 3  
*adurukh*, I, 3, 4, II, 1, 4, 3, 3, III, 2, 5, *adurukh*,  
 III, 1, 2, § VII, 3, *adurukh*, § XI, 8 In II,  
 3, 3 *adurukh* most probably goes with *adurukh* and  
 in III, 2, 5 with *adurukh*  
*adurukh*, III, 2, 6, (*adurukh* B) § VIII, 11  
*adurukh*, I, 3, 4  
*adurukh* (with acc) I, 4, 2, (adv) II, 3, 5,  
*adurukh* (with acc), see *adurukh*  
*adurukh*, I, 2, 2, &c.  
*adurukh*, II, 3, 2  
*adurukh*, II, 1, 8  
*adurukh*, II, 3, 6  
*adurukh*, I, 4, 2  
*adurukh*, III, 1, 2, 4, § VII, 7, 8  
*adurukh* (acc), I, 3, 1  
*adurukh*, II, 2, 4  
*adurukh*, II, 2, 2  
*adurukh*, II, 1, 8, 5, 6, *adurukh*, II, 1, 8,  
*adurukh*, II, 1, 8, (acc masc) I, 3, 8, (acc  
 neut) I, 3, 8, II, 3, 2.  
*adurukh*, § XI, 1  
*adurukh*, III, 2, 4 (*adurukh*, § VIII, 7)

*akṣammanāḥ*, III, 2, 1, Ś VIII 2, (acc)  
III, 2, 1, Ś VIII 2

*akṣatṛe* (nom.), Ś X, 5; (acc) III, 1, 4, Ś  
X, 5, *akṣatṛak*, III, 2, 1, Ś VII, 20, (gen  
plur) III, 2, 2; Ś II, 10, V III, 1, *akṣat*  
*trani* (acc), Ś II, 10, VIII, 1.

*akṣa*, II, 1, 2; 4, 8, 2, 2, 3, 4, 3, 8; 4, 3.  
III, 1, 3.

*a* (with abl), I, 3, 8, II, 1, 6, 8, (with acc  
and *śāsvat*) II, 3, 7

*akṣaḥ*, I, 2, 3, II, 1, 6, 3, 3, 3, 6, III, 1, 1, 2,  
Ś VII, 2, &c., (instr) Ś X, 3, (acc) Ś X, 3,  
I, 5, (loc) II, 3, 1, III, 1, 2, 2, 3, Ś VII, 3.  
*akṣyam*, II, 1, 4

*agnimarutāya*, I, 5, 3 Cf *agnimarutakṣam*  
Ś II, 18

*agraya*, III, 2, 4, Ś I, 1, (nom plur) III,  
2, 6, Ś VIII, 21.

*agraya*, I, 1, 2.

*agrayam*, II, 6

*agraya* (acc), I, 1, 1, *agraya*, I, 1, 2, *agraya*, I,  
1, 2, *agraya*, Ś I, 2

*akṣaya*, I, 1, 1

*akṣa* (= body), I, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 8, II, 3, 4,  
5, (acc) I, 2, 2, 3, 8, Ś II, 3 (= vital  
self) I, 3, 7, (gen) I, 3, 7 (= self in  
various senses) II, 3, 1, 2, 7, 4, 1, 5, 6,  
III, 2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, Ś VII, 6, VIII, 1,  
&c., (acc) I, 3, 5, II, 3, 1, 2, 7, 5, III,  
1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, Ś VII, 3, &c.,  
(instr) II, 1, 8, 6, (dat) II, 3, 7, III, 2, 4  
(gen) III, 2, 1, Ś VIII, 1, *akṣam*, II, 5,  
Ś XI 1, *akṣam*, I, 5, 2, Ś I, 8, &c.

*akṣamāyā*, II, 5

*akṣa*, III, 1, 4, Ś VIII, 7

*akṣa*, II, 5

*akṣa*, I, 4, 2, II, 3, 1, 2, 5, 7, 4, 1, 2,  
III, 1, 2, 2, 3, 4, Ś VII 3, VIII, 7, &c.,  
(gen) II, 1, 7, 3, 7, III, 2, 5

*akṣam*, I, 1, 3, &c

*akṣa*, III, 1, 4, Ś VIII, 7

*akṣamāyā* (acc) I, 1, 3 (nom) Ś XI, 7

*akṣa*, III, 1, 2 (instr), Ś VII, 3

*akṣa* *akṣamāyā*, I, 4, 3, 5 2. *akṣamāyā*,  
I, 2, 4, *akṣa*, II, 3, 4, 8, *akṣamāyā*, II,  
2, 4, Ś II, 18, *akṣa*, I, 3, 8, 3, 2, *akṣa*,  
I, 5, 1, *akṣamāyā*, III, 1, 3, Ś VII, 10,  
*akṣamāyā*, III, 2, 6, Ś VIII, 11, 2, 8, I, 6,

*akṣa*, I, 3, 8, *akṣa*, II, 5, 6, *akṣa*, I, 1,  
3, 2, 1, 3, 3, 8, 5, II, 5, &c., *akṣamāyā*,  
I, 4, 2, *akṣamāyā*, I, 3, 7, *akṣamāyā*, Ś II, 5,  
*akṣa*, II, 3, 1, *akṣamāyā*, I, 1, 1.

*akṣa*, I, 3, 5, II, 1, 7, 8, 3, 1, 3, 4, 1, 2,  
6, Ś I, 4, VII, 2, X, 1, &c. *akṣa* (acc),  
II, 4, 1, 1 of B in Ś X, 7, XI, 1, *akṣa*  
(acc), II, 4, 3, *akṣamāyā* (abl), II, 4, 1, *akṣa*,  
II, 1, 7, *akṣa*, III, 2, *akṣamāyā*, Ś I, 4, II, 1.

*akṣamāyā*, III, 1, 3, (acc) II, 4, 2.

*akṣa*, I, 1, 3, &c., (acc) I, 3, 8, &c., Ś VII,  
2, &c., (abl) I, 3, 2, II, 3, 5, (loc) I, 2, 2.

*akṣamāyā*, I, 1, 3

*akṣamāyā* I, 2, 2, III, 2, 6, Ś VIII, 11.

*akṣamāyā*, I, 5, 3, Ś II, 18.

*akṣa* (acc fem), III, 1, 5, (nom masc 1)  
Ś VIII, 9, prob *akṣa* (nom. fem)

*akṣamāyā*, I, 2, 2, II, 3, 1, Ś II, 14, (acc)  
10, (instr) I, 5, 2

*akṣamāyā*, II, 4, 3, (nom plur) II, 4, 3

*akṣamāyā* (dat), II, 4, 2

*akṣa*, I, 3, 3, II, 1, 6, 3, 6

*akṣamāyā*, II, 3, 2

*akṣamāyā*, II, 3, 6, (acc masc) II, 3, 6,  
*akṣamāyā*, Ś XI, 2

*akṣamāyā*, II, 3, 2

*akṣa* *akṣa*, I, 1, 1, *akṣamāyā*, II, 1, 4, *akṣamāyā*,  
II, 6, *akṣa*, II, 1, 4, *akṣamāyā*, II, 1, 8

*akṣamāyā*, I, 2, 4, (acc) I, 2, 4

*akṣa* *akṣa*, I, 3, 2, &c. *akṣamāyā*, I, 1, 2, II, 2, 4,  
3, 1, 8, *akṣa*, II, 1, 2, 3, 7, 5, *akṣamāyā*,  
II, 3, 8, *akṣamāyā*, I, 2, 3, *akṣamāyā*, II, 3, 1,  
*akṣamāyā*, II, 3, 4, Ś II, 18, *akṣamāyā*, II, 1, 7,  
*akṣamāyā*, II, 1, 1, *akṣamāyā*, I, 3, 2, *akṣamāyā*,  
II, 1, 1, *akṣamāyā*, II, 5, *akṣamāyā*, II, 2, 3, *akṣamāyā*,  
III, 2, 4, Ś VIII, 7, *akṣamāyā*, II,  
3, 7, *akṣamāyā*, II, 3, 5, *akṣamāyā*, III, 1, 6, Ś  
VII, 18, *akṣamāyā*, III, 2, 5, Ś VIII, 11,  
*akṣamāyā*, III, 2, 6, Ś VIII, 11, *akṣamāyā*,  
III, 2, 3, *akṣamāyā*, Ś XI, 3, *akṣamāyā*,  
Ś XV, 1, *akṣamāyā* (gen), Ś I, 4,  
*akṣamāyā*, Ś I, 4

*akṣa*, II, 1, 1, 5, *akṣamāyā*, II, 1, 8;  
*akṣamāyā*, II, 1, 8

*akṣa*, II, 5, (acc masc) Ś VIII, 7, (nom  
plur masc) II, 3, 1, (acc plur masc) II,  
3, 1, (gen plur masc) II, 3, 2, (loc plur.  
masc) II, 3, 2, (loc plur. acc) I, 1, 2

*iti*, I, 1, &c. (summary of an enumeration)  
 II, 6, III, 2, 3, § V III, 2, 9  
*idam* (nom pron), I, 3, 4, I, II, 1, 1,  
 (nom adj) II, 1, 1, 4, (acc pron) I, 3, 5,  
 II, 1, 1  
*idam idraḥ*, II, 4, 3, (acc.) II, 4, 3  
*Indraḥ*, I, 1, 1, &c., < I, 1, &c., (acc.) I, 2,  
 2, < XI, 1, (gen) I, 2, 1, II, 2, 3, § I, 2  
*In brāhṁam*, I, 2, 1.  
*Indraḥ* *īṇ*, I, 1, 4  
*indrayam*, I, 2, 2, (loc) I, 2, 2, (nom plur)  
 III, 2, 1  
*īṇam* (adj), I, 1 2, 3, 2, 4, 3, &c.; *īṇam*  
 (pron) I, 3, 4, III, 2, 5, *īṇamāi* (caus  
 adj), II, 3, 7, *īṇam* (nom adj), I, 2, 3,  
*īṇe* (acc du adj), III 1, 8 *īṇe* (nom  
 plur adj), I, 1, 2, 2, 3, 6, 1, *īṇiḥ* (nom  
 adj), I, 3, 1 II, 1, 1, (pron.) III, 2 5,  
*īṇam* (nom adj) I 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 2 II, 1,  
 1, 2, 8, 6, *īṇam* (adj), I, 2, 4, *īṇaḥ* (acc.  
 adj), II 1, 6, *īṇam* (acc adj) II 1, 8  
*īṇam* (adj) I, 1, 4, II, 1, 2, III, 2, 5 (pron)  
 II 1, 2, III, 2, 8  
*īṇamāyāḥ* II, 1, 3  
*iva* (almost = *eva*) *cirātaram iva*, I 1, 2, *ai*  
*dhalatīvaṇva* I 2, 3, *satīmadatīva*, I 3 2 8,  
 5, 1, II, 1, 2 5, 3, 2, 6, 4, 3, 6, III, 2,  
 4, 6, § VIII, 2, VI 3  
*īṇam*, I, 2, 4, *īṇaḥ*, I 2, 4  
*īṇa*, I, 1, 2, II, 4 3, III, 2, 5, § V II, 3  
*īṇaḥ* *upēkṣita* II 2, 4, III, 2 4, § V III,  
 7, *īṇaḥ* II, 4 1 3, *īṇaḥ*, § VI 4,  
*ābhīṇaḥ* (v l.) II 4, 3  
*īṇaḥ* *prēkṣita*, I 2, 3  
*īṇaḥ* *prēkṣita*, II, 1, 2  
*īṇaḥ*, I, 5, 1  
*īṇaḥ* *īṇa* (3rd sing), II, 1 2, 5  
*īṇaḥ* *caruḥ* I, 1, 1, *īṇaḥ*, *prēkṣita*,  
 II 3, 5 Cf *īṇaḥ* *yadū* *ni* *pāpāṇyāḥ*, §  
 I, 8  
*ni*, I, 1, 1, &c., (= *or*) I, 1, 1, *ni* *īṇaḥ*, I, 3, 8  
*nīṇam*, I, 1, 1, § I, 4, (acc) II 3 1, 2, §  
 I, 5, (loc) III, 2, 3, § II, 1, (acc plur)  
 I, 3, 8 (gen plur) I, 2, 1  
*nīṇamāḥ* I, 2 4, 3 1  
*nīṇamāḥ* I, 2, 1, &c.  
*nīṇaḥ*, I, 1 4 (from *īṇaḥ*)  
*nīṇaḥ*, II, 3, 6

*nīṇaḥ*, II, 1, 2; § V II, 3  
*nīṇam* I, 1, 2  
*nīṇaḥ*, I, 4, 2, II, 1, 4, (nom neut.) III, 1,  
 5, (abl du ucat) II, 1, 3  
*nīṇaṇam*, III, 2, 1, &c., § V II, 2, &c.  
*nīṇaṇamāḥ* II, 1 3  
*nīṇaḥ*, III, 2, 4, < V III 7  
*nīṇam*, I, 2, 1, II, 1, 4, III 2, 5 § II, 1, 1;  
 V III, 9, (loc) I 5, 1 < II, 1, 1  
*nīṇaḥ*, II, 3, 3, (gen) § V III, 8, (loc.) §  
 VI, 1.  
*nīṇaṇam*, I, 2, 3, § 1, 7  
*nīṇaḥ* I, 2, 4  
*nīṇaḥ*, II, 3, 8  
*nīṇaṇam* (v l. *nīṇaṇam*), II, 6  
*nīṇaṇam* *undamā*, I, 2, 5  
*nīṇaṇam* III, 1, 1, 1, 5, § V II, 2, (acc) §  
 VI, 1, (loc.) III, 1, 6, § V II, 18, (nom  
 plur) III, 2, 1, § V III, 8  
*nīṇaḥ*, III, 1, 4, § V III, 7, (acc) §  
 XI, 3  
*nīṇaḥ* (with abl.), I, 2, 4  
*nīṇaḥ*, III, 1, 3, (*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ* B) § V II, 18  
*nīṇaḥ* III, 1, 2, § V II 3  
*nīṇaḥ* II, 1, 6, § II 1  
*nīṇaḥ* I, 3, 7, § I, 7  
*nīṇaḥ* (gen neut.), I 3 7 *nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ* (instr  
 masc.) III, 1, 6, § V II, 19, *nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ*, I,  
 2, 3  
*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ* (as nom, acc., and instr) I,  
 III 1, 1 § V II, 10  
*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ*, III, 1, 3, § V II, 10  
*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ*, I, 4, 2  
*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ*, II, 3, 1.  
*nīṇaḥ*, I, 2, 3  
*nīṇaḥ*, II, 1, 4  
*nīṇaḥ* (acc.) II, 1, 4 *nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ* (v l.) I, 5, 2  
*nīṇaḥ*, III, 2, 3, § V III 3  
*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ* II, 3 8 (a *īṇaḥ*)  
*nīṇaḥ*, II, 1, 3  
*nīṇaḥ* II 1, 3, 3, 8, II, 1, 6, 3, 4 (nom pl r)  
 I, 4 1, § II, 10, (acc.) *īṇaḥ*, (instr) § II, 10  
*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ* I, 4, 2  
*nīṇaḥ* I, 1, 2, 5, 1, II, 1, 4  
*nīṇaḥ* *īṇaḥ* (v l. *nīṇaḥ*), I, 5, 1  
*nīṇaḥ* I, 2 3 < I, 7, (acc) I, 2, 4, (gen) I,  
 2, 3, 4, § I, 7  
*nīṇaḥ*, I, 5, 2, II, 1, 4, 3, 3, 4, 5





I, 2, 2, the following indefinite pronominal phrases occur *yad* = *kimca*, II, 1, 2, *yad* *va* *kimca*, I, 3, 1, *ya* *l* *ha* *kimca*, II, 3, 3, *yac* *ca* *kimca*, II, 3, 2, *yat* *kimca* *iam*, II, 6, *yad* *i* *ina* *kimca*, I, 4, 2, &c., II, 1, 2, &c., III, 1, 6, &c., *yad* *ha* *kimcedam*, II, 1, 2, *ya* *l* *kalca*, II, 3, 6, *ya* *l* *kimca*, II, 3, 6, *ya* *ya* *kimca* *iam*, II, 4, 2, *ya* *ya* *kimca* *iam*, II, 1, 6, *ka* *ca* *kimca*, II, 3, 8, *kimca* *kimca*, I, 1, 3, &c., *kimca* (acc.), III, 2, 4, § XI, 4, *ka* *l* *et*, § VII, 8, *yad* *i* *dam* *kimca*, § VII, 15, *yat* *kimca*, § 2, 2, &c.

*ka* *l* *et*, I, 2, 2

*katara* *l*, II, 6, *katara* *va*, II, 4, 3

*ka* *l* *ham*, II, 4, 3, *na* *ka* *l* *ham* *va*, § XIII

*ka* *l* *ca* *kimca*, II, 1, 6

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 5

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 5

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 2, 4 (*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § VII, 7)

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca* *iam*, I, 2, 1, (acc.) I, 2, 2

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 4, 1, (acc.) III, 2, 4, § VII, 7;

(abl.) II, 4, 1

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 1, 3, (dat.) II, 1, 7, (abl.) II,

1, 6, (dat. plur.) II, 5

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca* *iam*, II, 3, 5

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 8

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca* *iam*, III, 2, 4

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 6, (acc.) I, 1, 4, 3, 1, (nom. plur.)

I, 1, 3, § II, 16, (acc. plur.) I, 1, 2, 3,

2, 4, 3, 7, II, 3, 6, § II, 16, (dat. plur.)

II, 3, 6, (gen. plur.) I, 1, 2, 3, 3, 7, *ka*

*l* *va* *kimca* (adv.), I, 1, 1, III, 2, 4

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 3, 1, 7, II, 1, 6, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (with

adv.), § XI, 8

*ka* *l* *va*, § VII, 6

*ka* *l*, II, 3, 6

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 2, 6, § VII, 11

*ka* *l* *va*, I, 5, 2, II, 3, 6, III, 2, 8, § VII, 9

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 1

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 3, 2, (acc.) II, 5

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 6

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 1, 3, § VII, 8, 9

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 2, 4, &c., *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 4, 2,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 6, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 2, 2, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*,

I, 1, 2, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 1, &c., § VII, 7,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 1, 3, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*,

III, 1, 5, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 3, III, 2, 4,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*,

I, 1, 2, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 2, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*

*va*, I, 2, 2, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 1, 2, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 5, 1. Cf. *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* and *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 5, for *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, cf. *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, §

II, 4.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 5, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (adv.), § VII, 10,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (adv.), I, 3, 5

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 1, 1

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 5, III, 1, 4, § VII, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*,

III, 2, 4

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 2, 4, § VII, 4.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 2, 4.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 1, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § I, 2,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 3, 8

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 6; *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 3, 4.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (adv.), § XI, 1,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 8, 6, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*,

§ XI, 1; *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § VII, 7.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 8 (a Sloka)

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 3, (gen.) I, 1, 3

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 2, 2, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 2, 2

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 2, 2

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 6 (*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § VII, 21),

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (adv.), § VII, 11

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, III, 2, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § XI,

4, where is *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* for *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 2, 4.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 1, 5, § VII, 18.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 4

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 3

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 4

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 2, 4 (*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, §

VII, 7), *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (adv.), II, 4, 3, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 2, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § II, 17.

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 7, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 6

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 5, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (with acc.),

I, 5, 1, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1,

1, 2, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 1, 4; *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I,

1, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 1, 6, § VII, 14, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*

(acc. masc.), II, 5, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca* (acc.), II, 3, 8,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 2, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 3,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § VII, 2, 3, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, § I, 6

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 5, (acc.) II, 5, (loc.) II, 5

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, I, 3, 4, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, III, 1, 1; §

VII, 2, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 1, 5, *ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 2, 3,

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 2, 2

*ka* *l* *va* *kimca*, II, 3, 4

- ५ *thi*, II, 1, 6  
*gini*, II, 4, 2, ५ *NI*, 4, *gāh*, II, 6, *gā*,  
 III, 1, 6, ५ *NI*, 19, *gā* (gen.), ५  
 ५ *NI*, 4  
*guyatram*, I, 4, 1, II, 3, 4, ५ *NI* 7, (acc.)  
 I, 1, 3  
*guyatru*, I, 1, 1, &c., ५ II 7, (acc.) I, 4, 3,  
 5, ५ II, 8, *guyatru* (nom. plur.), ५ II,  
 10, *guyatru*, ५ I, 2, (loc. plur.) I, 4, 1,  
*guyatru*, II, 1, 8  
*guh*, I, 1, 3  
*gū*, *gū*, II, 1, 8, *gū*, III, 2, 4 (acc.)  
*gū*, ५ *NI*, 4, 2, *gū*, II, 1, 4  
*gū*, II, 2, 1  
*gū*, *gū*, I, 2, 4, *gū*, III, 1,  
 2, ५ II, 3, *gū*, II, 4, 3, *gū*,  
 II, 4, 3, *gū*, II, 4, 3, *gū*,  
 II, 4, 3  
*gū*, II, 3, 6  
*gū*, II, 1, 6  
*gū*, I, 1, 6  
*gū*, II, 4, 3, *gū*, ५ II, 17, *CI* *gū*  
*gū*, ५ II, 17  
*gū*, I, 4, 1, *gū*, ५ II, 3, *CI* *gū*,  
 ५ II, 3, and *gū*.  
*gū*, *gū*, II, 6  
*gū*, I, 1, 4  
*gū*, II, 2, 4, *gū*, II, 2, 2  
*gū*, III, 2, 4, ५ *NI*, 7, which has *gū*  
*gū*.  
*gū*, I, 1, 4, &c., see *Intro* p 65 ५ VII and  
 VIII agree with the *Intro*  
*gū*, *gū*, I, 4, 1, II 1, 4, 6, 8, 2,  
 1, 2, 4, 3, III 2, 5 ५ VII, X, 1, &c.  
*gū*, I, 3, 8, &c., ५ VII, 3 &c. (acc.) II,  
 1, 7 ५ X, 4 (instr.) II, 1, 7, 4, 3, (abl.)  
 II 4, 1, (gen.) II, 1, 7, III, 2, 5, (nom.  
 du.) II 3, 8  
*gū*, *gū*, III, 2, 1, 2, 3,  
 ५ VIII 1, 2  
*gū*, II, 2, 3, ५ VIII, 3, *gū*, I, 1,  
 2, *gū* (acc.), *gū* (loc.), ५ II,  
 10, *gū*, ५ II, 11  
*gū*, III, 2, 2 ५ VIII 1  
*gū*, II, 3, 6, (acc.) ५ II, 10  
*gū*, III, 2, 1, ५ VIII, 1  
*gū*, I, 2, 3, ५ VIII, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565,

- 2, 4 *ekidra*, 5 V III, 2, (nominal) *ekidra*, 5 V III, 9  
*churukena*, I, 2, 4  
*jagati*, I, 3, 4, II, 1, 6, *jagatisahsram*, II, 3, 5  
*jaguriam*, II, 6  
*ajana jayate*, I, 2, 2, II, 1, 2, (*adhrva jayate*, *a-jayate*) 3, 1, 1, *prajayate* I, 2, 4 &c., *prajayate*, I, 2, 4, *prajante* I, 1, 1, 8, II, 1, 7, *ajayate*, II, 4, 3, *prajate*, II, 3, 6, *prajate*, I, 3, 4, *prajayate*, II, 5  
*janma* II 5, (gen) II, 5  
*ajap japat* I, 3, 2, III, 2, 4, 5, 5, I, 4, *japate* II, 1, 4  
*jigatam* (acc. neut.), I, 1, 3, (nom) 5 V I, 2, *jagati* 10, I, 2, 3  
*jagatav* I, 1, 2  
*jagadasyam*, I, 5, 3, *vedasyah* I, 5, 3  
*jyasa* III 1, 6, 5 V II, 16, (acc.) I, 3, 5, *jyagyas* 6 V I, 8  
*jyagyas* II 6  
*ajasa* 5 *adhrvayasa*, I, 2, 2 &c., *ajasa jayate*, 5, V III  
*jihma* III, 2, 4 (*adhrvama* 5 *ajasa* 5 V III 7)  
*jihma sravasi* III, 2, 4, 5, V III, 7  
*jahva* III 2, 1  
*ajasa jayate* I 5, 2, *jyagyas* III 2, 4, 5 V III, 7, *prajate* 5 V I, 8, *prajate* (gen masc) 5 V I, 8  
*jyagyas* 5 *ajasa* (acc.) II 3, 8, (instr) II 3, 8  
*jyagyas* (acc) II 3, 8, (instr) II 3, 8  
*jyagyas* II 6  
*ajasa jayate* II 1, 7  
*ajagad* *ajagad*, II, 6, III 2, 5 (*ajagad* *ajagad* 5 V II, 12), *prajagad*, II, 3, 5, *ajagad* I, 2, 2, *ajagad* II, 2, 3, *adhrvayagad* II 4, 2, *ajagad* (acc. neut.), II, 3, 2, *ajagad* III 2, 4, 5 V III, 2, *ajagad* 5 *ajagad*, 5 I 6  
*ajagad* I, 4, 2  
*jyagad* (2nd III, 1, 1, *jyagad*, I 3, 4, 7  
*jyagad*, II, 3, 1, (acc.) II, 1, 7, (nom. plur) II, 3, 1, II 6, III, 2, 2, 5 V II 1  
*ajagad* *prajagad* (gen. masc) III 2, 4 (*prajagad* 5 V III, 7), *prajagad*, III 2, 4  
*makirah* III 2, 6, 5 V III, 11  
*makirah* 5 *ajagad*, III 2, 6, 5 V III, 11, (acc.) III, 2, 6, 5 V III, 11  
*lat* (nom), I, 1, 2, &c.; *lat*, I, 1, 2, &c., *lat*, I, 2, 2, II, 3, 6, *lat*, I, 1, 1, &c., *lat* (masc.), II, 2, 4, *lat* (neut.) II 1, 2, *lat* (gen), I 2, 2, 3, 4, II 3, 6, *lat* (instr.), II, 3, 1, *lat* (nom), I, 4, 1, 2, II 2, 4, *lat* (nom. neut.), I, 1, 2, *lat* (acc. fem), II, 4, 2, *lat* (gen. masc.), II, 3, 6, *lat*, I, 1, 1, &c., *lat*, I, 1, 2, &c., *lat*, I, 1, 2, II 1, 1, *lat* (acc.) I, 3, 5, *lat* (dat), II, 4, 2, (abl) II 4, 3, *lat* (=so, then) I, 1, 1, &c., *lat* (=therefore), I, 1, 1, &c., *lat* (=therefore), I, 2, 2, 4, II, 2, 3, *lat* *yad*, I, 2, 3, 4  
See also *Introd*, V I, p 58  
*lat* I, 3, 3  
*latamam* (acc. neut.), II 4, 3  
*latat*, II, 2, 4  
*latatav* I, 1, 3  
*latprastish* *prastish*, I, 1, 2, &c.  
*latra* II, 2, 6 III 2, 5  
*latannakritah*, III, 2, 5, 5 V III, 9  
*latam* *prastish*, *prastish*, II 2, 5, *prastish*, II, 5, *prastish*, I, 4, 3 Cf *latamam*, II, 4, 1  
*latat* II 1, 6, *latat* II, 2, 6  
*latatannakritah* II, 1, 6  
*latatav* III, 2, 5, 5 V III 9  
*latamam*, II, 3, 6, *latamam* 5 I 4  
*latat* *prastish*, I 2, 4, II, 2, 1, 2, *prastish* *prastish*, II 4, 1, 3 *prastish* II 2, 3, *prastish* *prastish* II 4, 1, *prastish* *prastish* (abl), II, 4, 3  
*latatannakritah*, I 2, 2, *latatav* I, 2, 2  
*latatannakritah*, III, 2, 5, 5 V III, 9  
*latat* I, 2, 3  
*latat* I 1, 8, II, 1, 7, *latat*, II, 2, 4, 3, 8, (acc.) I, 5, 2  
*latat*, II, 3, 6  
*latatamam*, I, 2, 4  
*latat* I, 1, 2, &c.  
*latat* II 1, 8  
*latamam* III 1, 6, 5 V II, 18, *latatannakritah*, 5 *latat*, 5 II, 1  
*latat*, I, 1, 1 *latat*, I 1, 1, *latat*, 5 II, 1, *latat*, 5 II, 2  
*latat*, I 4, 3, (acc.) I 4, 3, (nom. plur) II 3, 4, (abl. plur) II, 3, 4  
*latat* II 2, (adv) II 2, 3  
*latat* *adhrva* - *latat*, I, 2, 2, *adhrvayagad*, I, 2, 1

- śrīp* + *śamotṛp*; au, II, 2, 8, *śamotṛp*, II, 4, 3, *śrīp* + *śamotṛp*, X, 1, &c, *śrīp*,  
*śa*, *śam*, *śak* (m and f) X, 2 sq  
*śeṣ*, I, 1, 3, 2, 2; (acc) II, 5, (loc) I, 2, 2,  
*śeṣa*, I, 1, 3.  
*śrī* *śrayata*, II, 2, 1  
*śray*, I, 1, 1, &c, *śar* ṣ, I, 2, 2, II, 1, 1,  
 3, 4; *śram*, I, 1, 2, 2, 3, II, 3, 3, 4, III,  
 1, 2, *śram* (neut), I, 3, 4  
*śrīmā*, I, 1, 2.  
*śrīmāṇ*, I, 2, 2.  
*śrī*, I, 1, 1, &c  
*śrīmāṇam* (acc neut), I, 5, 2  
*śrīmā*, I, 5, 3  
*śrīv*, I, 4, 1, II, 1, 5, (name) II, 3, 4, *śri-*  
*śrī*, I, 1, 2, &c  
*śrīp*, I, 1, &c, ṣ I, 2, (acc) I, 2, 2, &c,  
 (nom plur.) ṣ I, 2.  
*śrīp* + *śrayata*, I, 5, 2, (gen. plur) I, 5, 2;  
 (loc plur) I, 5, 2  
*śrīd*, II, 3, 4, b, II, 2  
*śrīmāṇ*, I, 2, 2, ṣ I, 2, *śrīmāṇam*  
 (nom), ṣ. VI, 7, (acc) I, 1, 3, (instr) ṣ  
 II, 1.  
*śrīp* + *śram*, I, 3, 4  
*śram*, II, 1, 4, 2, 3, *śram*, II, 2, 3, *śr*, III,  
 1, 3, *śray*, I, 3, 4  
*śrī*, I, 4, 1, II, 2, 6, 4, 1, (acc) II, 4, 2,  
 (instr) II, 4, 3, (abl) II, 4, 3  
*śrīmāṇ*, I, 3, 4 (from Rgveda)  
*śak*, I, 4, 2, II, 3, 4, ṣ II, 5, *śak* +  
*nam* II, 2, 3, *śak* + *nam* (nom), I, 2, 3  
*śak* + *nam* (acc), III, 2, 4, ṣ XI, 4  
*śay* *śayata*, II, 3, 6 (with instr)  
*śar* + *śar*, I, 2, 3  
*śar* + *śar* + *śar*, II, 3, 3  
*śar*, I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, with *śar*, II, 2,  
 4, *śar*, II, 3, 4  
*śar*, I, 3, 8, II, 3, 4  
*śar*, I, 5, 2  
*śar*, I, 3, 7, *śar*, I, 4, 1.  
*śar* + *śar* (nom neut), I, 7, 7  
*śar*, I, 3, 4, *śar* + *śar* (instr), I, 4, 2  
*śar* + *śar*, II, 2, 3, *śar* + *śar*, I, 1, 4, *śar*  
*śar*, II, 2, 6, ṣ XI, 8, *śar*, II, 1, 5, *śar*  
*śar*, I, 1, 4, *śar* (nom neut), II, 3, 4  
*śar*, II, 2, 6  
*śar* + *śar* (nom plur. fem), I, 2, 3  
*śar* + *śar*, S. VII, 10 (*śar* + *śar*, A  
 III, 1, 3)  
*śar* + *śar* (fem), I, 3, 4  
*śar*, II, 1, 6, *śar* (nom), II, 1, 5; 7, 2, 3,  
 4, 1, 2, ṣ VII, 4, X, 6, (acc) II, 1, 1,  
 6, ṣ X, 6, *śar* (abl), II, 1, 7, *śar*,  
 II, 1, 7.  
*śar* + *śar*, III, 2, 4, ṣ VIII, 7.  
*śar* + *śar*, I, 2, 2; *śar* + *śar*, I, 2, 2.  
*śar* + *śar*, I, 4, 1 Cf J. R. A. S., 1909, p. 204  
*śar* + *śar* (3rd sing), I, 1, 2  
*śar* + *śar*, III, 1, 4, ṣ VII, 5  
*śar* + *śar*, II, 4, 3.  
*śar* + *śar*, I, 1, 1, and see *śar*  
*śar* + *śar*, II, 3, 1, III, 2, 4, *śar*,  
 I, 2, 3, *śar*, III, 2, 4, *śar*, III,  
 2, 4 (*śar*, ṣ. VIII, 7), *śar*, II,  
 1, 3; 8, *śar*, II, 4, 2, *śar* (nom  
 neut), II, 4, 2, *śar*, III, 2, 4, ṣ VII,  
 7, *śar*, II, 4, 3  
*śar*, II, 6, *śar* (acc), ṣ XI, 3  
*śar*, II, 3, 4, *śar*, I, 1, 4, II, 1, 2, 4;  
 3, 8, 2, 1, 2, 1, 8, 6, *śar*, II, 1, 8,  
*śar* (abl), I, 1, 4, (abl) II, 1, 8, *śar*,  
 I, 4, 3, II, 1, 2, III, 2, 6  
*śar*, II, 1, 8, III, 1, 3, *śar*, III, 1, 4,  
*śar* (dat), II, 4, 2, *śar* (nom),  
 I, 3, 2, 8, II, 1, 5; 3, 3, ṣ XI, 2, (acc)  
 II, 2, 4, ṣ XI, 2, *śar*, II, 4, 2  
*śar* + *śar*, II, 2, 4  
*śar* + *śar*, II, 2, 8, (abl) ṣ I, 8  
*śar* + *śar* or *śar* + *śar* (ṣ), I, 2, 4  
*śar* + *śar* (acc), I, 1, 8  
*śar*, I, 3, 1, *śar* (gen), I, 3, 1 (w r for  
*śar*)  
*śar*, I, 4, 3, *śar*, *śar*, III, 2, 5, ṣ  
 VIII, 9, *śar* (gen, v l), I, 3, 1.  
*śar*, III, 2, 3, ṣ VIII, 3, (acc) ṣ  
 VIII, 7  
*śar*, I, 2, 2  
*śar*, I, 2, 3, II, 1, 2, 7, 4, 1, III, 1, 1,  
 2, 2, 4, ṣ VII, 2, &c, *śar*, II, 4, 1,  
 III, 1, 3, 6, ṣ VII, 15, &c, *śar*, ṣ X,  
 4, *śar* (gen), II, 1, 7, III, 1, 2, 2, 4,  
 ṣ VIII, 8, *śar*, III, 1, 2, 3; 2, 3, ṣ  
 VII, 3, &c.  
*śar* + *śar*, III, 1, 2; ṣ VII, 1, (acc)  
 III, 1, 2, *śar* + *śar*, I, 3, 8 (from  
 Rgveda), *śar* + *śar* (gen), ṣ VII, 3



- I, 2; 4, 1; (acc) II, 4, 2, *mutalabhyam* (abl), II, 4, 1  
 √ut *anayāt*, II, 4, 2, *pranayanta*, II, 1, 5, *pranatah*, II, 1, 5  
*rugadah*, II, 3, 6  
*nidhanam*, II, 3, 4  
*marbhujam*, III, 1, 3, 5 VII, 10, (acc) III, 1, 3, 5 VII, 10; (gen) III, 1, 3, 5 VII, 10  
*nirbhujaprasādh*, III, 1, 3, 5 VII, 10  
*nirbhujasaktroh*, III, 1, 5; 5 VII, 12  
*nivut*, I, 5, 2, (acc) I, 5, 2, 5 I, 3  
*nirvāḥkṛnam*, I, 2, 2, 5, 3  
*nirvāḥya*, I, 5, 2  
*nistah*, III, 2, 4, 5 VIII, 7  
*nu*, II, 4, 1, III, 1, 1, 2  
 √nu *pranavam*, I, 5, 2; *pranavati*, 5 II, 1  
*ne* *ucchadyai*, I, 2, 4, *atāt*, I, 5, 2, *atāt* *int*, 5 I, 1  
*nahā*, I, 2, 4, *nasam*, I, 2, 4  
*nyunam*, I, 4, 2, *nyune* (loc neut), I, 1, 2, &c  
*nyunastara*, I, 1, 2, (acc du neut) I, 3, 4  
*paśah*, I, 4, 2, II, 3, 4, *paśam* (acc), 5 II, 4, *paśmāḥ*, 5 II, 4  
*paś au*, II, 3, 8  
*paśkṛtā*, I, 1, 3, 3, 8, 4 2 II, 1, 6  
*paśca*, I, 2, 2, 3, 8, II, 6, 1, 5 VII, 21, *paśca catvarisārchānam*, III, 2, 2, 5 VIII, 2  
*paścākṛtāh*, II, 3, 4  
*paścāda am*, II, 3, 4  
*paścapada*, I, 3, 8  
*paścam*, II, 3, 3, 4  
*paścāram*, I, 3, 8  
*paścāsmatāh*, I, 1, 2, &c  
*paścāsmatāh*, I, 1, 2, &c, 5 I, 1, &c, (nom neut) I, 1, 2, II, 3, 4, (acc masc) I, 1, 2, (nom plur neut) I, 2, 2  
*paścāsmatāh*, II, 3, 3, (nom neut) II, 3, 1, 4, 6, (acc) II, 3, 4, 8  
 √paś *paśanti*, II, 1, 2, *upāśanti*, I, 4, 2, *sampāśanti*, III, 2, 4, *paśyate*, II, 1, 4, *prapaśan*, II, 4, 2  
*paśāra*, II, 6, 1  
*paśyati*, I, 3, 5  
*paśyena*, *paśyati*, I, 4, 2  
 √paś *prapadyai*, II, 4, 3, *prapadyate*, I, 2, 2, &c, *alīkṛtepradyate*, I, 3, 3, *abhi*  
*sampadyante*, I, 1, 2, 2, 3, 8; *padānt*, 5 VIII, 7, *apadyate*, II, 1, 4, *prapadyate*, II, 1, 4, 4, 3, *pralipiyeta*, I, 3, 2, *sampadyamāna*, II, 3, 6, *sampāśanah*, II, 3, 2, (nom neut) II, 3, 4, &c, (gen neut) II, 3, 4, &c, *abhiśamāna*, I, 2, 4, *prapāśan* *nam*, I, 3, 4, *prapāśan* (loc), II, 1, 4, *abhiśampadyat*, II, 3, 5, *padā*, II, 2, 2, *abhi*  
*sampāśayanti*, III, 2, 2, 5 VIII, 2  
*padam*, I, 1, 1, II, 2, 2, *pad* (acc), I, 3, 7, *padam* (acc), 5 II, 1  
*paśmāntarāṅg* (sem), I, 5, 2, (acc masc plur) 5 II, 16, (instr) ib  
*paśvat*, I, 3, 7  
*paśvāh*, II, 1, 1, *paśvanam*, III, 2, 4, *paśvāḥ*, II, 1, 6 (from Rgveda)  
*paśvā*, III, 1, 3, *paśva* (masc), III, 1, 6, 5 VII, 14, *paśva* (prep with acc), II, 4, 1; *paśvamat*, III, 2, 4, 5 I, 1, *paśvamin*, ib  
*paśvāt*, II, 3, 6  
*paśvat* (with gen), II, 2, 4  
*pa a*, see *dā*  
*paśu*, II, 1, 8, (1 neut) 4, 3, *paśu*, II, 3, 6  
*paśvacānam*, II, 1, 2, &c  
*paśu* (with acc and *gachati*), I, 5, 1  
*paśvāna*, II, 4, 3  
*paśvāpāśyāt*, II, 4, 3  
*paśyānt*, III, 1, 1, 5 VII, 3, &c  
*paśyastvat*, I, 2, 1  
*paśmā*, III, 2, 2, 5 VIII, 2, (acc) I, 4, 1, *paśman*, III, 2, 1, 2, 5 VIII, 1  
*paśu*, III, 2, 5  
 √paś *paśyati*, II, 3, 2, 6, *paśyanti*, II, 3, 2, *paśyāt*, III, 2, 3 (vid) 1, 5 VIII, 3, 4, 5 VIII, 7, *paśyeta*, III, 2, 4, *apaśyāt*, II, 4, 3, *apaśyam*, II, 1, 4, *apaśyate*, I, 2, 4, *paśyate*, I, 2, 4  
*paś* *ī* (=a sacrifice), II, 3, 3, (=cattle) *paśa* *eat*, I, 1, 2, &c, 5 II, 1, &c, *paśu* *int*, I, 5, 1, II, 3, 1, 5 II, 16, *paśvāḥ*, I, 2, 4, &c, 5 VII, 2, &c, *paśmānt*, I, 1, 2, &c, *paśmānt*, I, 1, 2, 5, 1, 5 I, 1  
*paśmānt*, I, 1, 3, III, 2, 1, 2, 3, 5 VIII, 1, &c  
*paśmānt*, I, 1, 3, 5 XI, 7  
*paśmānt*, I, 3, 8  
*paśyāt*, I, 1, 2  
*paśman*, II, 3, 4  
*paśmānt*, II, 1, 6



*pradīn* II, 1, 7, 8  
*pradīśamatre*, I 2, 4  
*prapade*, II, 1, 4, (*instr*) II, 1, 4  
*prabhatah*, III, 1, 6, § VIII, 11  
*prafasana* I, 1, 1  
*prastavahamāh*, III, 1, 1, § VII, 1  
*prahūtam*, II, 1, 5  
*prah* (with *abl*), II, 3, 3, 4  
*pr* in *prah*, I, 1, 4  
*prajapatyam*, I, 1, 1, § I, 1.  
*prnaṣ*, I, 1, 7, 8, II, 1, 4, 3, 6, III, 1, 1, 4, 6, 1, 6, § VII, 8, &c, (= smell) II, 4, 1, 2, (*acc*) II, 1, 7, III, 1, 6, 1, 6, 1, VII, 8, &c, (*amukam*) II, 1, 5, (*instr*) I, 4, 1, &c, II, 1, 6, &c, III, 1, 6, (*abl*) II 4, 1, (*amukā*) II, 3, 6, III, 1, 1, 1, VII, 8, (*gen*) II, 1, 7, III, 1, 3, § VIII, 8, (*loc*) II, 1, 4, III, 1, 6, 1, 6, § VIII, 11, (*nom plur*) I, 1, 2, 1, 4, 3, 7, 8, II, 1, 2, (*acc*) I, 1, 2, (*instr*) I, 5, 2, (*gen*) I, 3, 8  
*prmaṣṭv* (*nom neut.*), II, 3, 1, *prmaṣṭvāḥ* (*nom plur*), II 3 1, (*acc plur*) II, 3 1.  
*pranaprayaḥ* (*loc.*), II, 3, 3  
*pram*, I 3, 4  
*prdar* II 1, 1  
*pralurbhavaṁsi*, III 1, 4 § VIII, 7  
*prayah* (with *gen*) I 1 1, (*gen*) III, 1, 3.  
*praya* *prayaḥ*, § VI, 8  
*pramāṇāḥ* I, 1, 3, (*acc.*) I, 1, 4, (*gen*) I, 1, 3  
*preṇkhatram*, I, 1, 3  
*prp* *prpnyant* I 3, 3  
*phalakam*, *phalake* *phalal* *ma* I, 1, 3  
*phalam*, II, 3, 6, (*acc*) I, 1, 4, II 3 6  
*phaniḥ* *sambhāṣanam* (*sem*) I 4 1  
*phraṣṭam*, III, 1, 4 (*var daktam*, § VIII, 7, VI, 2)  
*phandhuna*, II, 1, 4  
*phatim*, III, 1, 6, § XI, 1, *phale*, § VI, 1.  
*phalarat*, III, 1, 1, § VII, 3  
*phalam*, II, 1, 3  
*phān*, I, 1, 3, *phāt*, II, 3 6.  
*phāruṣam*, I, 1, 3  
*phāruṣāḥ*, III, 1, 3, § VIII, 4  
*phādā* *śuddhātre* II, 3 7  
*phalamam* (*nom*), § II, 5, VI 7, (*acc*) I, 1, 3, *phalāḥ*, *phāram*, I, 4, 3, VI, 2, 9.  
*phāruṣai* (*abl*), § II, 10, *phāruṣāḥ*, VI, 11, 11

[illegible]



√*dhak* *dhakrayati* III, 2, 4 (*dhakrayati*, S. XI, 4)

*dhakram* (acc.), I, 2, 4

√*bhag* *bhagayati* III, 4, 2; *bhagayate*, III, 1, 5 (*bhagayate*, S. V II, 12).

*bhadrani* (neut.), II, 3, 4.

*bhagya*, III, 2, 4

*bhagrayam* (acc.), II, 4, 2

*bhagrayati*, II, 5

√*bhā* *bhāṣate*, III, 2, 6, S. V II, 18, *bhāṣate*, III, 2, 5, *bhāṣamāṣat*, III, 2, 5, (gen masc.) S. VIII, 11

√*bhā* *nirobhāṣati*, *nirobhāṣati*, II, 4, 1.

√*bhā* *bhāṣya* I, 3, 4

√*bha* *bhāvati* I, 1, 1, &c., *bhāṣa* - *bhāvati*, II, 3, 1, *anubhāvati* (with acc.), II, 2, 5, *bhāvati* (with acc.), II, 3, 7, *stambhāṣati*, II, 1, 8, *abhiṣṭambhāvati* (with acc.), I, 3, 8, II, 3, 7, *parābhaṣati* II, 1, 4 &c., *bhaṣati* I, 1, 2, 3, 7, II, 4, 2, III, 1, 2, *abhiṣṭambhāṣati* (with acc.) II, 3, 7, *bhāṣati*, I, 1, 1, &c., S. VII, 21, *abhaṣati*, I, 1, 1, II, 1, 4, 2, 2, *anubhāṣati*, II, 5, 6, *abhaṣati*, II, 1, 4, *abhaṣam* II, 2, 2, *stambhāṣati*, III, 2, 2, *bhāṣana* (= creatures), I, 3, 4, 8, II, 1, 2, 5, 6, 2, 3, (acc.) II, 2, 2, 4, 3, III, 1, 6, 2, 3 (dat.) II, 1, 3, 8, 2, 2, (gen.) II, 3, 7, III, 2, 4, S. I, 1, V III, 7, (loc.) III, 1, 3, S. V II, 22, *stambhāṣana* (acc. masc.), II, 5, *bhaṣati* II, 3, 8, *bhaṣat* II, 3, 7, 4, 2, *stambhāṣa*, II, 3, 4, *bhaṣayati*, II, 1, 4, III, 1, 6, S. VII, 15, *bhaṣam*, II, 2, 4, *bhaṣam* II, 1, 8, *parābhaṣati* II, 1, 8, *bhaṣayati*, *adhiṣṭambhāṣati* II, 3, *bhaṣayati* III, 2, 3, *bhaṣayati* II, 5

√*bha* *bhaṣayati*, III, 2, 4

*bhaṣat* (interj.), I, 3, 2

*bhaṣamam*, I, 3, 4

*bhaṣa* (interj.), I, 3, 2, *bhaṣa* *bhaṣa*, II, 1, 8

*bhaṣati*, II, 1, 8

*bhaṣat*, I, 2, 4

*bhaṣayati*, III, 2, 5, S. VIII, 9

*bhaṣaya* I, 4, 2, II, 3, 6, *bhaṣaya* (neut.), II, 3, 6

√*bha* *bhāṣati*, II, 2, 2, 5, *abhiṣṭambhāṣati*, II, 1, 8

*bhaṣayati*, II, 1, 4, &c.

*maghā*, II, 2, 6, III, 2, 2; S. V III, 2, *maghāṣati*, III, 2, 1; 2; S. VIII, 12, 2, *maghāṣa*, III, 2, 2, 2; S. VIII, 2.

*maghāṣati*, III, 2, 4; S. V III, 7

*maghāṣati*, II, 6

√*magh* *anumaghati*, I, 2, 8; *anumaghati*, I, 3, 8; *parmaghati*, II, 1, 1, *parmaghati*, S. I, 4.

*maghāṣati*, II, 2, 1.

*maghāṣa*, I, 1, 3, 3, 4, (acc.) I, 1, 3, 3, 4; III, 2, 4.

*maghāṣati*, I, 2, 3, II, 2, 2.

*maghāṣayati*, I, 2, 2.

*maghāṣam*, III, 1, 8; S. V II, 2.

*maghāṣam*, II, 3, 3

√*man* *manayati*, I, 3, 5; *manya*, III, 1, 5, 2, 3, S. V II, 12, *manya* (with acc.), II, 3, 3, III, 2, 4, 2, 4, S. V II, 8, 9, V III, 7.

*manya*, III, 1, 1, S. V II, 2, *amala*, III, 2, 4, S. V III, 7, *amalaṣam*, III, 2, 3

*manayati*, I, 3, 2, 8, 4, 2, II, 1, 3, 4, 5, 3, 8, 4, 1, 2, 6, III, 1, 1, S. V II, 2, &c., (interj.) I, 3, 2, II, 1, 7, 4, 3, III, 1, 1, 5, 6

V II, 1, (dat.) II, 3, 5, (abl.) II, 4, 1, (gen.) II, 1, 3, 7, S. VIII, 8, (loc.) I, 3, 2, 5, X, 1, (nom. plur.) I, 3, 4

*manayati*, II, 6

*manayati*, III, 2, 1, 1, 3, S. V III, 2, 2, (acc.) II, 2, 1, 2, 3, S. V III, 1, 2

*manayati*, *manayati*, III, 2, 1, S. V II, 2, which has *manayati* in V II, 2, 3, for *manayati* only

*manayati*, III, 2, 6, *manayati*, S. V III, 7

*manayati*, II, 4, 1, (acc.) II, 4, 1

*manayati*, II, 4, 1, *manayati*, II, 4, 1, III, 2, 4, S. VIII, 7

*manayati*, I, 2, 2

*manayati*, I, 2, 2, (acc.) I, 2, 2, (gen.) I, 2, 2, S. I, 3

*manayati*, III, 2, 4, S. VI, 4

*manayati* (neut.), II, 3, 2, *manayati*, II, 1, 8.

√*man* *manayati*, I, 3, 8

*manayati*, I, 1, 2, II, 2, 2, S. VI, 1, *manayati*, I, 1, 2, &c., II, 2, 2, *manayati* (loc.), II, 4, 2, III, 2, 3

*manayati*, I, 2, 2, &c., S. I, 2, &c., *manayati*, I, 5, 2

*manayati*, I, 4, 3

*manayati*, III, 2, 3, S. V III, 3

*manayati*, II, 6, S. V II, 21

- mahamaghe*, III, 2, 4, *ak* or *ah* (I), *ś* VII, 3, 7, *ś* VIII, 7  
*mahāvratam*, I, 1, 1, *ś* I, 1, (instr) III, 2, 4; *ś* VIII, 6, (gen) I, 2, 1, (loc) III, 2, 3, *ś* VII, 4  
*mahāvratatvam*, I, 1, 1  
*√ma samnimimite*, II 3, 6, *maṣam*, II, 3, 6, *samnimāḥ*, I, 2, 4  
*maṣam*, II, 1, 6, III, 2, 1, *ś* VIII, 1  
*maṣa*, III, 1, 6, *ś* VII, 15  
*maṣa*, III, 1, 8, *ś* VII, 13, *maṣayam*, III, 1, 6, *ś* VII, 18, *maṣam*, *ś* XII, 8  
*maṣamātram*, III, 1, 5, *ś* VIII, 12  
*maṣam*, III, 2, 5, *ś* VIII, 9, (acc.) I, 3, 1, *maṣam* (gen), I, 3, 1  
*maṣa*, II, 1, 8, III, 2, 5, *ma*, III 1, 4, *ma* (dat), II, 1, 4, III, 1, 1, *maṣam*, II, 1, 5, *maṣa*, II, 1, 8, II, 4, 3, *ma* (gen), I, 4, 8, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 3  
*maṣam*, I 5, 3  
*maṣa*, see *maṣaḥ*<sup>a</sup>  
*maṣam*, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 1, 3, *maṣam* (acc.), III, 1, 6, *ś* VII, 18  
*maṣamam*, I, 2, 4, &c., (acc) I, 2, 4 &c., (instr) I, 2, 4, (abl) II, 3, 6, *maṣamam*, I, 2, 4  
*maṣamākaroti*, II 3, 6  
*maṣam*, II, 2, 2, (acc) II, 4, 2, (abl) II 4, 2  
*maṣamāḥ*, I, 2, 2  
*maṣamāḥ* (fem), I, 3, 5  
*maṣamāḥ*, I, 2, 4  
*√maṣa amureṣayā*, II, 4, 1  
*maṣam*, II, 4, 3  
*maṣam*, II, 1, 8, 3, 6  
*maṣam*, II, 1, 8, 4, 1, 2, *maṣam*, *ś* XI, 8, *maṣamamam*, *ś* XIII  
*maṣa*, II, 1, 5  
*maṣa*, III, 2, 4  
*yaḥ*, I, 1, 1, &c., *yaṣam*, I, 2, 3, &c., *ya*, *ca*, I, 2, 4, II, 2, 1, *ya*, I, 1, 2, *yaṣam*, I, 2, 4, &c., *yaṣam*, II, 1, 5, *yaṣam*, I, 2, 4, *yaṣam*, I, 1, 4, &c., *yaṣam* (neut.), II, 3, 1, *yaṣam* (gen), II, 3, 6, *yaṣam* (masc), II, 1, 4, 3, 8, *yaṣam*, III 2, 5, *yaṣam* (neut.), II 9, 2  
*ya*, II 1, 1, *yaḥ*, I, 3, 5, II, 1, 1, *yaṣam*, I, 3, 4, II, 2, 4, *yaḥ* (acc.) I, 3, 5, *yaṣam* (masc.), I, 1, 3, &c., (indef rel) *yaḥ yaḥ* (acc.), I, 3, 2, and see *kaḥ*  
*√ya yaḥ* *maṣam*, III, 2, 6, *ś* VIII, 11, *yaṣamamam*, I, 1, 2, 2, 2, (acc) I, 1, 2, 5, 1, (dat) I, 1, 4  
*yaṣam*, II, 3, 6, (instr) I, 3, 2, (abl) I, 3, 2  
*yaṣam*, II, 3, 3, (acc) I, 1, 4, (gen) III, 2, 3, *ś* VIII, 3, (loc) II, 3, 4, (gen plur) II, 3, 3, (loc plur) II, 2, 4  
*√yaṣa yaṣam*, III, 1, 2, *ś* VII, 3, cf *naḥ* *maṣam*  
*yaṣam*, II 1, 8  
*yaṣamam*, I, 1, 4  
*yaṣa* *laṣa*, II, 3, 8, *ś* VIII, 9, *yaṣa* *kaḥ* *ca*, I, 3, 8, 5, 2, II, 1, 5, *yaṣa* *kaḥ* *ca*, III, 2, 5, *laṣa* - *yaṣa*, I, 5, 2, *yaṣa* - *laṣa*, I, 3, 8  
*yaṣam* - *caṣam*, I, 3, 1, *yaṣam* *yaṣamam*, II, 4, 2, *yaṣam* (no verb), II, 4, 1, III, 2, 4, *ś* VIII, 7, *yaṣam* - *caṣam*, II, 1, 6, 3, 5, III, 1, 2, 1, 5, *yaṣam* - *laṣam*, II, 1, 2, 3, *yaṣam* *kaṣam* *ca*, III 1, 3, 4, *ś* VII, 8, 9, *yaṣam* - *caṣam* *kaṣam*, *ś* XI, 2, 2  
*yaṣam* *kaṣam*, I, 4, 1  
*yaṣam* *kaṣam*, II, 3, 2  
*yaṣam* *kaṣam*, III, 1, 5  
*yaṣam* *kaṣam*, I, 5, 1  
*yaṣam* (adv) - *kaṣam* (time), I, 2, 1, &c., (causal) I, 3, 1, &c., *yaṣam* (causal), II 1, 2, &c., (condit) II, 3, 6, &c., after *abhiyāna* *eva* (with *yaṣam*), III, 2, 3, 4, *ś* VIII, 8, 9  
*yaṣam* (time), III, 2, 4, *ś* VIII, 7 (The temporal sense is really practically conditional)  
*yaṣam*, I, 1, 2, &c., *ś* VII, 10, &c.  
*√yam samprapachate*, II, 1, 2, 3, 7, *udaya* *chan*, I, 2, 1  
*yaṣam*, I, 4, 3, II, 3, 7, (dat) I, 4, 2, (instr) III, 2, 2, &c., *ś* VII, 2, &c.  
*yaṣam*, II, 3, 5  
*√ya yaṣam*, III, 2, 4, *yaṣam*, I 1, 4  
*yaṣam* - *laṣam* - *laṣam*, II, 1, 7, *yaṣam* (with *dyataprithu* nom da as II *naḥ*) I 3, 8, *yaṣam*, I 5, 2  
*√ya yaṣam*, II, 3, 8, *yaṣam* *yaṣam*, I, 3, 5 (from *Rigveda*)  
*√yaṣa* *maṣam* - *yaṣam* II, 3, 8, *yaṣam* (nom), II, 3, 8, *yaṣam*, *ś* I, 8, *yaṣam* (du) II, 3, 8, *yaṣam*, II, 3, 8, *yaṣam* (masc), III, 2, 4, *yaṣam* (v I *yaṣam*), *ś* XI, 8  
*yaṣam* (plur), II, 3, 8  
*√yaṣam* *abhiyāna*, I, 3, 4  
*yaṣam*, I, 2, 4, &c., *yaṣam*, I, 4, 2, *yaṣam* (dub), ital

√*saks* *saktiyate*, III, 1, 6; √ II, 19  
*rajyatuḥ*, I, 2, 3  
*ratharya*, III, 2, 4; √ III, 7; XI, 3.  
*rathan* *ibhish*, III, 1, 4; √ III, 7  
*rathanīstaram*, I, 4, 2, II, 3, 4; (gen) III, 1,  
 6, √ II, 4, VII, 19, √ III, 8  
*ratnayaḥ*, III, 2, 4, √ III, 7  
*raśah*, II, 3, 2, III, 2, 3, √ III, 3, *raśam*,  
 √ II, 1.  
 √*rāḥ* *rājati*, II, 3, 7  
*rājanam* (*iḍma*), II, 3, 4, √ II, 1  
*rāśiḥ*, II, 1, 8, *raśayoh*, III, 2, 2, √ VIII,  
 2, *rāśiḥ*, II, 2, 4  
*rāśiśānta*, III, 2, 4  
*rāśiśāntaḥ*, I, 1, 1  
*raśimāḥ*, I, 1, 1  
 √*ric* *ricyate*, II, 3, 6; *ricyāt*, II, 3, 6,  
*rikam*, II, 3, 6, *atiriktam*, I, 9, 2  
 √*ris* *riyati*, III, 1, 3, √ II, 9, 10  
 √*riś* *reḥi* *reḥaḥ*, III, 1, 6 (borrowed from  
 a RV passage), √ II, 18  
 √*ru* *riruruciceta* (v. l. *riruruciceta*), III,  
 2, 5  
 √*rudh* *avarudha*, I, 1, 2, 3, 3, 7, *avaru*  
*dhyāt*, I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 2, 4, 3, 7, *avaruna*  
*dhi*, I, 4, 3  
 √*ruh* *adhiraḥati*, *adhiraḥanti*, *adhiraḥat*, I,  
 2, 4, *avadhiraḥataḥ*, I, 2, 4, *avaraḥet*, I, 2,  
 4, *avadhiraḥanti*, I, 2, 4, *avaraḥanti*, √  
 II, 9, 10  
*rupam*, I, 2, 1, &c., √ VII, 10 &c., (instr)  
 I, 2, 2, 4, II, 2, 3, 3, 7, √ II, 19, (abl)  
 I, 2, 1  
*rupasam* *rddham*, I, 1, 3, &c., *\*rddhyat*, I, 5, 2,  
*\*rddham*, I, 5, 2  
*ruśah*, I, 1, 2, 4, 2, II, 1, 3; 3, 3, 7, 4, 1,  
 2, 5, III, 1, 2, 2, 2, √ VII, 2, 2, 7.  
 (acc) √ X, 7, (abl) II, 4, 1, (gen) II, 1, 2,  
 √ III, 2, (loc) √ X, 1, &c.  
*ruśam* (V), see *devarūśam*  
  
 √*śadh* *śadhe*, II, 2, 4, *śadhāmanāḥ*, √ XI, 1  
*śatam*, II, 1, 2  
*śahā*, I, 4, 2, 3, II, 1, 3, 6, 6, III, 1, 6, √  
 VII, 14, (acc) I, 4, 3, II, 1, 2, 1, 1, 3,  
 3, 7, 8, (instr) III, 1, 1, &c., √ VII, 2,  
 &c., (abl) II, 3, 7, 6, (loc) I, 4, 3, II, 1,  
 3, 8, 5, 6, √ XI, 4, (nom plur) I, 1, 2,  
 2, 3, 4, II, 4, 1, 3, 5, (acc) II, 4, 1, √

I, 5; (gen) I, 1, 2; 2, 5, (loc) II, 3, 7,  
 (nom du) I, 2, 3.  
*śahyaśāḥ*, III, 2, 3; (acc) II, 4, 1.  
*śat* *śatam* (acc.), II, 3, 1  
*śandit*, II, 1, 6, 4, 1; √ I, 4 (*śandit*, √  
 √ III, 11), (acc) II, 4, 2, (abl) I, 3, 8, II,  
 4, 1  
*śandita* (scat), III, 2, 5; (*śandita*) √  
 √ III, 9  
*śaktam*, II, 3, 3; 7, III, 2, 1, √, √ III, 1.  
*śakti*, III, 2, 4, √ VIII, 7  
  
*śamāḥ*, III, 1, 4, 2, 1; √ II, 8, 9; √ III,  
 1, (acc) III, 1, 4, √ II, 8, 9, (nom  
 plur) III, 2, 1, √ III, 1  
*śamā* *śamāḥ* (proper name), II, 1, 1  
 √*śac* *śacāma*, III, 2, 2, 3, √ III, 2,  
*śacata*, II, 2, 2, *śacam*, √ I, 6, *śaca*, II,  
 2, 3, √ I, 6, *śac*, √ I, 6, *śaktam*, I, 3, 2, &c.  
*śamāḥ*, I, 2, 2, √ II, 1, (acc) I, 2, 2,  
*śamāḥ*, III, 2, 4, √ III, 5, *śamāḥ*, I,  
 2, 2, *śamāḥ*, √ VII, 15  
*śala*, II, 2, 2, 4, 2  
 √*śad* *śadati*, II, 1, 5, 3, 2, 6, 8, √ II,  
 2, *śadate*, √ I, 8, *śadanti*, I, 3, 2, II, 1, 2,  
 3, 2, *śhishvadati*, II, 1, 6, *śadam*, I, 3, 4,  
 II, 3, 8, *śadāma*, II, 1, 4, *śadati* (?), √ XIII,  
*śhishvadati*, III, 2, 3, 4, √ II, 8, 9, *śadate*,  
 I, 5, 2, *śhishvadati*, I, 3, 7, *śadit*, II, 1, 5,  
*śadit*, II, 2, 5, *śhishvadit*, √ II, 15,  
 &c. *śhishvadati*, √ VIII, 9  
*śamāḥ*, III, 2, 3  
 √*śap* *śapante*, I, 5, 2, *śamāḥ*, II, 3, 1  
*śayam*, II, 1, 4, 6, III, 1, 5, 2, 6, √ III,  
 11, *śam* (acc.), II, 4, 2  
*śayam*, I, 2, 4, 4, 2, (proper name) II, 1,  
 1, *śayam*, I, 2, 4, 4, 2  
*śayam*, II, 5  
*śayam* (acc.), II, 2, 3, √ I, 6  
*śarāḥ*, III, 2, 4, (instr) III, 2, 4  
*śarūḥ*, II, 1, 7, (gen) II, 1, 7  
*śarūḥ*, II, 1, 7, (gen) II, 1, 7, (nom plur)  
 I, 5, 2, II, 2, 1, (acc) II, 2, 1, √ XI, 8  
*śat*, I, 5, 2, II, 6, √ II, 11, (acc) I, 5, 1,  
 √ II, 10, 11, (loc) I, 3, 4 (?), 5, 1, √ II, 11  
*śat* *śat*, I, 2, 4  
 √*śas* *śasya*, III, 2, 4, √ XI, 4  
 √*śas* *śas*, II, 1, 6  
 √*śuk* *śakati*, II, 1, 7, *śru* *śakati*, III, 2, 4,

- zakhots*, II, 1, 6    *zakhots* II, 3, 8,  
*zakhots* II, 3, 8, *zakhots* I, 1, 4  
*zakhots* I, 2, 2, 4, 3, 8, II, 6, (=or)  
I, 4, 1, II, 1, 2, 8, III, 2, 6, § VIII,  
7, &c., *zakhots* III, 1, 6, § VII, 14  
*zakhots* III, 2, 4  
*zakhots* I, 1, 1, 4, 3, 1, 8, 4, 2, &c., § VII,  
2, &c., (acc.) I, 1, 1, 4, 3, 1, 8, II, 1, 6,  
III, 1, 6, 2, 6, § VIII, 8 &c., (instr.) I, 3,  
2, II, 1, 6, 7, 2, 5, 8, III, 1, 1, 6, 8  
VII, 2, &c., (gen.) I, 3, 1, &c., § VIII, 8,  
(loc.) II, 3, 3, III, 1, 6, 2, 6, § VII, 18,  
&c., (acc. plur.) III, 2, 5  
*zakhots* III, 2, 6, *zakhots* § VIII,  
10  
*zakhots* III, 2, 5  
*zakhots* III, 2, 1, 2, 3, § VIII, 1, 2, (acc.)  
III, 2, 1, 2, 3, § VIII, 1, 2  
*zakhots* I, 2, 1  
*zakhots* III, 2, 3, § VIII, 9  
*zakhots* II, 2, 1  
*zakhots* I, 2, 3, II, 2, 1, 2, 7, 3, 4, 1, III,  
2, 4, § VII, 3, &c., (acc.) § XI, 1, (gen.)  
II, 1, 7, III, 2, 3, (loc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 4  
*zakhots* I, 1, 3, &c.  
*zakhots* I, 2, 1  
*zakhots* I, 3, 4, 5, II, 2, 1, 4, 2  
*zakhots* (acc.), III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1  
*zakhots* II, 3, 6  
*zakhots* I, 3, 1  
*zakhots* I, 3, 1  
*zakhots* I, 4, 1 (nom. sing. or nom. plur.)  
*zakhots* II, 6, (gen.) III, 2, 5  
*zakhots* I, 1, 2, &c., § VII, 14 &c.  
(1st pers.) II, 1, 3, 8, *zakhots* II, 3, 2, §  
VIII, 9, *zakhots* I, 5, 2, II, 1, 5, III, 1, 4,  
§ VII, 8, *zakhots* I, 3, &c., § VIII, 11,  
&c. *zakhots* (gen.) I, 3, 4, § I, 8, (acc.  
pl.) § VII, 14, *zakhots* § VIII, 11,  
*zakhots* III, 1, 6, *zakhots* III, 1, 2,  
§ VII, 2  
*zakhots* I, 3, 8  
*zakhots* III, 2, 3, 8, *zakhots* I, 3, 5  
*zakhots* III, 1, 2, § VII, 3, (acc.) III, 2, 4, §  
VIII, 7, (nom. pl.) § XI, 2, (acc.) § VI, 1  
*zakhots* II, 3, 3, 4, *zakhots* (v. *zakhots*)  
II, 3, 1, *zakhots* II, 3, 3, 4
- zakhots*, II, 1, 7  
*zakhots* I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 1, (acc.) I, 1, 2,  
(loc.) I, 3, 4, (instr. du.) I, 4, 2, (nom.  
plur.) I, 4, 1, 5, 2, (acc.) I, 5, 2  
*zakhots* I, 3, 4  
*zakhots* II, 1, 6, *zakhots* I, 2, 4,  
*zakhots* II, 1, 2, 4, 2, *zakhots* II, 4, 2,  
*zakhots* II, 4, 2, *zakhots* II, 1, 4, *zakhots*,  
I, 3, 8, *zakhots* II, 1, 1, *zakhots* (acc.  
plur.), II, 1, 5, *zakhots* (sem.) I, 3, 8, *zakhots*,  
I, 1, 1, *zakhots* § XI, 1, *zakhots*,  
§ XI, 2, *zakhots* § XI, 2, *zakhots* § XI, 1,  
*zakhots* I, 1, 1  
*zakhots* I, 2, 2 (in an etymology), II, 2, 2,  
*zakhots* I, 2, 4, III, 1, 6, § VII, 14,  
*zakhots* III, 1, 6, § VII, 14, *zakhots*,  
§ VII, 15  
*zakhots* (acc.), II, 1, 6 (from Rgveda)  
*zakhots* II, 1, 2  
*zakhots* II, 3, 7  
*zakhots* II, 4, 3 (Monier Williams' Dict.,  
but not Whitney, *Roots*, &c., and *zakhots* is  
much more probable)  
*zakhots*, *zakhots* *zakhots* (acc.), III, 1, 3, § VIII,  
9 *zakhots* (gen.), § VIII, 10  
*zakhots* I, 2, 1  
*zakhots* I, 1, 3, 2, 2, 4, 2, (acc.) I, 3, 1, 2,  
(loc.) I, 2, 2, (nom. plur.) I, 4, 2  
*zakhots* I, 1, 3 *zakhots* I, 3, 7  
*zakhots* I, 2, 4  
*zakhots* II, 1, 5, *zakhots* II, 3, 8  
III, 2, 5, *zakhots* (nom.) II, 1, 6  
*zakhots* II, 3, 6, § XI, 1, 2, (acc.) I, 2, 4  
*zakhots* *zakhots* II, 3, 6, *zakhots* (acc.)  
§ VII, 10, II, 1, 3, 5 *zakhots* I, 3,  
2, *zakhots* II, 1, 6  
*zakhots* I, 1, 1  
*zakhots* II, 3, 6  
*zakhots* *zakhots* III, 1, 2, § VII, 3  
*zakhots* I, 2, 4, 3, 1  
*zakhots* I, 2, 1  
*zakhots* II, 1, 2, § VII, 2, *zakhots* *zakhots*  
(*zakhots* II), § VII, 3  
*zakhots* (acc.), I, 2, 4, better read *zakhots*  
*zakhots* I, 3, 2, II, 2, 2, III, 1, 6, 2, 4, § VII,  
18, (acc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3, (gen. plur.)  
§ II, 1  
*zakhots* III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3  
*zakhots* I, 1, 1, &c., § VII, 2, &c.

sat idam, I, 5, 3  
 √yag yagac, I, 2, 2  
 vyāhyanant, II, 2, 4, § VIII, 11  
 vyānah, II, 3, 3; § VIII, 8, X, 8, &c  
 vyāritā, I, 3, 1  
 vyāritā, II, 2, 2, (nom plur) I, 3, 2, (acc.)  
 I, 3, 2, § I, 6  
 √vraj vrayajata, III, 2, 4, § XI, 4  
 √tama tamasa, I, 2, 3, &c, § II, 1, &c, V  
 VIII, 5, &c, anulamsata, I, 5, 2, parivam  
 sat (with acc and instr), I, 4, 2, tamat,  
 III, 2, 4, tamta, II, 2, 3, tarvayantam, II,  
 2, 3, yate, § I, 5, last-o, I, 5, 1, talavata,  
 II, 2, 3, anulasyanta, II, 3, 4, tamam, § I, 1  
 √tāh taknot, III, 1, 4, § VI 8, &c, alaknot,  
 II, 4, 3, taknuvam, taknuvantam III 1, 4,  
 § VII, 8, alakāt, III, 1, 4, § VII, 8,  
 alaknuvam, § VII, 8, alaknuvantam, § VII, 9  
 tamam I, 2, 2, 4, 2, II, 2, 1, 3, 4 (acc.) II,  
 2, 1, § XI, 8, tamam (akāśa), II, 3, 6,  
 (tāpā), III, 2, 1, § VIII, 2  
 tataramā, II, 2, 1  
 tataramātaravaya, II, 2, 4, § II, 17  
 tatāhā, II, 1, 4  
 tatāvatā, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9  
 tarivam, II, 1, 4, 2, 4, III, 2, 1, (acc.) II,  
 1, 4, (abl.) II, 1, 4, § XI, 1, (gen.) II, 1,  
 4, (loc.) § XI, 1, (nom plur) II, 1, 2, 3,  
 (acc.) II, 1, 2, (instr) II, 3, 5  
 tarivataim (acc.) II, 1, 4  
 tarivatarvātā, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 3  
 tarivādhātā, II, 5, 6  
 tarivayā (gen.), I, 3, 4, tarivayam, I, 3, 4  
 tatāt, III, 1, 6  
 tatāramam, I, 2, 1, tatāramam, § I, 6  
 tatāhā, I, 1, 3, &c, tatāhā (dat.) I, 1, 3, &c,  
 § I, 4, &c, tatāramam (or tatāhā), I, 1, 3, &c  
 tatāramam, III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1  
 tatāhā, I, 4, 1, II, 3, 4, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9,  
 (gen.) II, 1, 4, § II, 2, (loc.) III, 1, 2, §  
 VII, 3  
 tatāt am, II, 1, 4, (acc.) II, 1, 4  
 tamam, II, 4, 1, (acc.) II, 4, 2, (instr) II, 4,  
 1, (abl.) I, 3, 3, II, 4, 1  
 ta alayāt, II, 1, 4, tayānah, II, 5, adhātā,  
 § II, 4  
 tarām, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 4  
 tarāyāt, I, 5, 1

tatāhā, I, 2, 4  
 tatāhā, II, 1, 5  
 tatāhā (acc. du.), III, 1, 3, § VII, 10  
 √tas tasyat, II, 3, 6  
 √tir atar, II, 1, 4, taryat, II, 1, 4, ataryat,  
 II, 1, 4  
 √tir taryatāt, III, 2, 4, § XI, 4, yāt,  
 § II, 11  
 tadāham, II, 1, 7  
 √tra taryanta, I, 2, 2, ataryata, II, 1, 4,  
 tatāhā, I, 3, 2, (sem.) II, 1, 4  
 tatāhā, I, 2, 3, 2, 4, taryam, I, 2, 4, taryat (dat.),  
 I, 4, 2, taryat (nom.), II, 1, 4  
 tiramam, I, 1, 3  
 √tra taryanta, II, 1, 7, taryat, II, 6, tiru  
 vanta, II, 1, 7, atiraman, II, 1, 4, tiruayāt,  
 III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7, upatiruyāt, III, 2, 4  
 (upatā, § VIII, 7), atirātā, III, 2, 4, §  
 VIII, 7, tirutanta, § VIII, 9, tirutam (nom.),  
 II, 4, 3, tirutā, II, 3, 8, tirutā, II, 4, 3  
 tirutavādanā, III, 2, 5, § VIII, 9  
 tirūham, I, 3, 3  
 tirūhātā, I, 1, 5  
 tiro, III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7  
 tirutam, I, 3, 8, II, 1, 4, 4, 1, 2, § VII, 4  
 &c, (acc.) II, 1, 7, § VI, 6, (instr) II, 1,  
 2, 4, 3, (abl.) II, 4, 2, (gen.) II, 1, 7, III,  
 2, 5, (loc.) § XI, 2, (nom. du.) II, 3, 8  
 tirutamāhā, III, 1, 2, 3, 3, § VIII, 1, 2,  
 (acc.) III, 2, 1, 2, 3, § VIII, 1, 2  
 tlesma, II, 3, 3, tlesma, § II, 1  
 tlekhā, II, 3, 8  
 √troz pratāstā, II, 1, 8  
 trostanam (acc. neut.), II, 3, 2  
 tot, I, 3, 8, 4, 2, III, 2, 4  
 totāramātam takāramam, II, 2, 4, 3, 8, 11  
 totāhātā-takāramam, § II, 17  
 tatpādā, I, 5, 2  
 totāramam, I, 3, 8  
 totāhātā (instr), III, 2, 1, § VIII, 1  
 ta, I, 1, 1, &c, ta, I, 2, 2, &c  
 tamayagāhā, II, 1, 5  
 tam vātarāhā, III, 2, 6, § I, 1, V, 5, (acc.)  
 III, 1, 6, § XI, 5, (adv.) I, 1, 1, (gen.) III,  
 2, 2, § VIII, 1, XI, 3, (instr) § XI, 5,  
 (nom. plur) § VII, 10  
 tamayātāramamāhā, III, 2, 3, § VIII, 1,  
 (acc.) III, 2, 3, § VIII, 1

- samśāda*, III, 2, 5.  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 3, 7  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 1, &c., § VII, 2, &c., (acc.)  
 III, 2, 3, 6, *samśrīṣṭh* (gen.), III, 1, 1,  
 2, 6, § VII, 2, *samśrīṣṭh* (acc.), III, 2, 6,  
 § VIII, 11  
*samśrī*, I, 2, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 6  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 8  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 5, 2, *samśrīṣṭh*, *samśrīṣṭh*  
*sakṣa*, I, 5, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 5, 2, § II, 16  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2, II, 6  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 1, 5, (gen.) II, 1, 5  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 1, 5  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2, II, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, § VII, 17,  
 (acc.) II, 3, 6, (gen.) II, 3, 8, *samśrīṣṭh*, I,  
 2, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, § VII, 17  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 6, (acc.) II, 3, 6  
*samśrīṣṭh*, *upaniṣad*, II, 2, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 3, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh* (acc.), II, 1, 6 (from Rgveda)  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 6  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2 (= Aitareya Brahmana, V, 16, 14)  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 2, § VIII, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 6, § VII, 17  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 2, § VII, 2, &c., (acc.) III,  
 1, 3, 5, (nom. plur.) III, 2, 2, (acc.) III, 2,  
 2, (gen.) III, 1, 2, § VIII, 1, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 5, § VII, 13  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 5, I, 2, III, 2, 4, with *samśrīṣṭh*,  
 III, 2, 1, § II, 10, VIII, 2, *samśrīṣṭh*,  
 II, 3, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 5, 1.  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 2, 6  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh* (nom. neut.), I, 1, 2, (instr.) I, 1, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh* (a prana), II, 3, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh* *samśrīṣṭh* (masc.), II, 3, 1, *samśrīṣṭh*  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 1, 2, III, 1, 1, *samśrīṣṭh* (dia.), III,  
 1, 1  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 5, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 5, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 1, 2, (instr.) I, 3, 8  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 2, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 4, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 2, (acc.) II, 2, 2,  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 2, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 4, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 2, § VIII, 1, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 3, 5, &c., § VIII, 1, &c., *samśrīṣṭh*,  
 II, 3, 6, § VII, 22, *samśrīṣṭh*, I, 1, 3, &c.;  
 § VII, 3, *samśrīṣṭh* (acc. neut.), I, 3, 5, II,  
 2, 1, &c., § VII, 2, &c.; *samśrīṣṭh* (gen.),  
 III, 2, 5, *samśrīṣṭh*, I, 1, 3, &c., § VIII, 1, &c.,  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 2, 2; *samśrīṣṭh*, I, 3, 4, II, 1, 2,  
 6, *samśrīṣṭh*, I, 1, 3, &c., *samśrīṣṭh*, II, 2, 3,  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 2, 2, *samśrīṣṭh* (neut.), I, 3, 4,  
*samśrīṣṭh* (dat. neut.), II, 1, 3, 8, 2, 2,  
 (abl. neut.) II, 5, *samśrīṣṭh* (masc.), I, 1, 3,  
 II, 2, 1, 2, (prof. neut.) III, 2, 4, § VIII, 7,  
*samśrīṣṭh* (neut.), III, 2, 3, § VII, 22, *samśrīṣṭh*,  
 § X, 1  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 5, § VII, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 8  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 2, 2, § VIII, 1, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 2, 2, (abl.) II, 2, 2, (gen.) I,  
 2, 1  
*samśrīṣṭh* (fem.), I, 2, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 4, (nom. plur.) II, 2, 4, 3, 8  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 3, 8  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, III, 1, 5, 3, 6, § II, 1, VII, 13, (acc.)  
 III, 1, 5, § VII, 13, (instr.) I, 3, 2, § II,  
 1, (abl.) I, 3, 2, *samśrīṣṭh*, I, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 3, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 1, 5  
*samśrīṣṭh* (acc.), III, 2, 2, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 5, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 1, 6  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 5, *samśrīṣṭh*, I, 4, 2, *samśrīṣṭh*, I,  
 1, 2, III, 2, 2, *samśrīṣṭh*, III, 2, 2, (uget (?) )  
 § VIII, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 4, 3  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 1, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh*, II, 4, 2, (gen.) III, 2, 4  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 4, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 4, 2  
*samśrīṣṭh*, I, 2, 2, II, 2, 2, (acc.) II, 2, 2,

(instr.) I, 2, 2; (gen.) I, 5, 3; (nom. du) I, 5, 2; (gen. plur.) I, 3, 8  
 sadadokāḥ, I, 4, 1, &c.; Ś II, 1, (instr.) I, 4, 2; (acc.) Ś II, 1.  
 √sr upasrtaḥ, III, 1, 6 (upasrtaḥ, Ś VII, 14).  
 √svr samsvapate, I, 3, 4; utsvapate, I, 5, 1; asvapa, II, 4, 1, upasvapa, Ś XI, 1; upa-  
 (sv)svape, Ś XI, 1; svapai, II, 4, 1; 3; Ś XI, 1, svataḥ, II, 1, 2, svasthāna (nom.), II, 4, 3; svataḥ, II, 1, 2, svataḥ (nom.), II, 1, 2; (fem.) II, 4, 2, upasvataḥ (fem.), Ś XI, 1; svatama, II, 4, 3, svastva, III, 2, 6; svastya, II, 4, 3, prastyaṇṇate, I, 3, 5.  
 √svr uksasvaf, II, 1, 4, svastyaṇṇate, I, 3, 5, samsvapate, I, 2, 4  
 tonāḥ, II, 3, 3  
 √skand askandiyate, III, 2, 4 (not in Ś VIII, 7)  
 √stan stanayate, I, 2, 1.  
 stanayan, I, 5, 1  
 √stabh stabhāṅganam (acc.), I, 4, 1, tistabhāḥ, uṣṭhāḥ, II, 1, 6  
 √stu prastanate, II, 3, 4, stuvā, III, 2, 4 (stuvaf, Ś VIII, 6), stuvāṇam, stuvate, Ś I, 4  
 stabhāṅganam, II, 3, 8  
 stomaḥ, I, 4, 1, (gen. plur.) I, 4, 2, 3, 1.  
 stomachāṅgāḥ (gen.), I, 4, 1  
 stomataḥ, II, 3, 4  
 stomachāṅganam (dot.), I, 4, 1  
 striyam, II, 3, 8, Ś XI, 4, stryam, II, 3, 7, 8, striyai (gen.), I, 4, 2, II, 5  
 sthātyaḥ, I, 5, 1  
 √stha sthātyate, II, 1, 1, 3, 1, prasthātyate, I, 1, 1, &c., aṣṭhātyate, II, 1, 8, prasthātyate, I, 1, 1, &c., aṣṭhātyate, I, 5, 2; uṣṭhātyate, II, 1, 4; aṣṭhātyate, II, 1, 4, sthātyam (nom.), I, 1, 1, prasthātyaḥ, I, 2, 2; prasthātyate, I, 3, 4; prasthātyam, I, 2, 2, 6, prasthātyaḥ, II, 4, 2, Ś X, 1, prasthātya, I, 4, 2; prasthātyayate, I, 2, 2, tathā, Ś XI, 1, 2; tathā, Ś XI, 1, 2  
 sthānābhyanam (abl.), III, 1, 3, Ś VIII, 10  
 sthāpakaḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś XI, 6  
 sthāpakaḥ, II, 6; (gen.) Ś XI, 5; (loc.) Ś XI, 5  
 svastva, II, 1, 6  
 svaritāḥ, III, 2, 5, Ś VIII, 8

svastyaṇṇam, III, 2, 1; Ś VIII, 1  
 svaritāṅgāḥ, II, 3, 6  
 √sṛṣṭi upasṛṣṭi, I, 2, 4; sṛṣṭi, II, 1, 6; sṛṣṭam (nom.), II, 4, 3; sṛṣṭu, II, 4, 3  
 sma, I, 1, 1, &c., in the form u ha sma, or ha sma, II, 1, 3, &c.; atha ha sma, Ś VII, 2 (see sma, A III, 1, 1)  
 svaritāḥ, II, 6  
 √svams svamsaḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś VIII, 11  
 svam, II, 5; svama (masc.), III, 2, 6; Ś VII, 14, (neut.) Ś II, 1.  
 √svad svadyate, II, 1, 7  
 √svaḥ svayate, III, 1, 6, Ś VII, 18, svataḥ, II, 1, 8  
 svataḥ, II, 4, 3; III, 2, 4; Ś XI, 4  
 svayam, III, 2, 4.  
 svar, I, 2, 1.  
 svataḥ, II, 3, 6; svataḥ, III, 2, 5; Ś VIII, 8, 9, svataḥ, II, 2, 4  
 svastyaṇṇam, III, 2, 1; Ś VIII, 1.  
 svastyaṇṇam, III, 1, 5; (svastyaṇṇam), Ś VII, 13  
 svargah, III, 1, 6, (acc.) II, 3, 8, (instr.) III, 1, 1, Ś VIII, 2, &c.; (nom. plur.) I, 2, 4; (loc.) II, 5, 6 (always with lokaḥ).  
 svargaham, III, 1, 3, Ś VIII, 10.  
 svastiyate, I, 5, 2; 3  
 svastyaṇṇam, I, 5, 2; 3, (acc.) I, 5, 2; 3; Ś I, 4  
 svastu, I, 3, 4, (acc.) II, 6.  
 √svad svadate, I, 3, 5  
 ha, I, 2, 1, &c.; Ś VII, 2, &c.  
 √ham hante, III, 2, 4; aṣṭhāntate, I, 1, 3; aṣṭhānta, I, 2, 2, 3, 4, hantya, II, 3, 6; hanta, I, 1, 2; aṣṭhāntya, II, 3, 8, aṣṭhāntya gāṇaḥ, II, 4, 3  
 hanta (with svay), II, 1, 4, Ś XI, 1.  
 hantam (acc.), I, 1, 4  
 hantā, II, 4, 2  
 hantāḥ, II, 6; (gen. voc.) Ś VIII, 8  
 hantā, I, 1, 2  
 √hā hantya, III, 1, 4, Ś VIII, 8, 9, tathā gāṇa III, 2, 4 (aṣṭhāntya, Ś VIII, 7), tathā hantā, Ś VIII, 7  
 ha, I, 1, 2, &c.  
 √hant hantā, II, 5, aṣṭhāntya, II, 1, 4  
 hantāḥ, I, 1, 2, (instr.) I, 3, 1.  
 hantāḥ, I, 3, 1.

*śivamśayak* II, 1, 3.

√*ku* *jukumaś*, III, 2, 6, § VIII, 11, *śukta*, III, 2, 4, *jukoti* § XI, 4, *śukam*, § X, 1, *jukyat*, § XII, 8

√*ku* *śūyate*, II, 2, 4

√*kr* *mākarati*, I, 3, 5, 7, 8, *vākarati*, I, 3, 3, III, 1, 1, *śākarati*, III, 1, 3, § VII, 10, *upadīkarati*, III, 2, 6, (*udā*) § VIII, 10, *pradīkarati*, II, 3, 4, *vākarati*, I, 5, 3, *śākarati*, III, 1, 6, § VII, 14,

\**karanti*, II, 1, 5, *ākarata*, II, 1, 7, *śākaraya* *karana* (?), III, 1, 6 (\**karana*, § VII, 14), *parikrāt*, III, 1, 1, § VII, 2, *anparikrāt*, III, 1, 1 (*parikrāt*, § VII, 2) *śākaraya*

*krīya*, II, 2, 3, 4, 3, *śākarīya* II, 4, 1

*krīyam*, II, 1, 3, 4, 1, 6, § VII, 3 &c, (acc)

II, 4, 2, (abl) II, 4, 1, (gen) II, 1, 3

*hata*, I, 1, 3, &c.

*śākrāt*, I, 2, 4

*śākrāt*, I, 5, 1

# WORDS IN ŚĀNKHĀYANA ARANYAKA VII AND VIII WHICH ARE NOT FOUND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA III

*akṣatena* (masc), VIII, 10

*akṣatamamśayak*, VIII, 4

*anpānigrahak*, VIII, 9

*aprasaktre* VIII 11

*ābrahmācarine*, VIII, 11

*śākarak* VIII, 5

*śākarakhararīkam*, VII, 14

*śākre* VIII, 7

*prābrahmācarak* VII, 10

*śākarak* VIII 11

*śākarakhararīkam*, VIII, 11

*śākre* VIII, 9

*śākarakhararīkam*, VIII, 9

*śākarak*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākre*, VIII, 3

*śākarak*, VII, 10

*śākarak*, VII, 10

*śākarak*, VII, 10, and see *śākarak*

*śākarak*, VII, 14

*śākarak*, VIII 9

*śākarak* (?), VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VII, 10

*śākarak*, VII, 10

*śākarak*, VIII, 10

*śākarak* (completive) VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII 9

*śākarak* (acc.) VII, 11

√*śākarak* *śākarak* VIII, 10

*śākarak*, VIII, 10

*śākarak*, VIII 10

*śākarak*, VII, 10

*śākarak*, VIII, 10

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11

*śākarak*, VIII, 11







## INDEX VI

### WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRANYAKA V, AND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES OF ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA I AND II, OTHER THAN THOSE OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified. The words noted as occurring in quotations might also be classed in Index IV, but are of a slightly different type.)

- Agmāh*, 1, 1, (acc.) 1, 2, (gen.) 1, 2  
*agnipucham*, 1, 2  
*agnisamāṣṭh*, 3, 2, Ś II, 2B.  
*agrena*, 1, 2  
*ahām*, 3, 2  
*aj*, *ajitā*, 3, 3, *abhyajya*, 3, 3  
*ajayād*, 1, 4  
*ajāh*, 1, 1  
*ajigrahyaṇ*, 3, 2  
*ajra*, 1, 1, 2, 6  
*ajha*, 1, 4, &c., *ajha ha*, 2, 4  
*ajhataḥ*, 3, 3  
*ajhataḥ*, 3, 1, (loc.) 1, 5  
*ajhāt*, 3, 3  
*ajhyayana*, 3, 3  
*ajharyam*, 3, 1, (acc.) 3, 2, (nom. plur.) 1, 5  
*ajam* *ayajama*, 3, 2, *abhyajya*, Ś I, 6,  
*abhyasana*, Ś I, 6  
*anagmā*, 3, 2  
*anagmāṣṭh*, 3, 2  
*anaparyas*, 1, 1.  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 3, 3  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 3, 3  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 1, 4  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 1, 1, 3, 2  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 3, 2 cf. *anāḥṣṭh*, Ś II, 17  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 3, 1.  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 1, 3  
*anāḥṣṭh* (with acc.), 3, 1  
*anāḥṣṭh* (in quot.), 1, 1  
*anāḥṣṭh*, 2, 5, (acc.) 1, 5  
*anjana*, 3, 3, *anjā*, 3, 2, 3, (acc.) 3, 3.  
*anjana* (acc.), 3, 3, *anjā* (dat.  
 masc.), 1, 4, *anjā*, 1, 6, 2, 1  
*anjā*, 1, 2  
*anjāḥ*, 3, 3  
*anjāṇ*, 3, 3  
*aj*, 1, 4, 6, 3, 3, *anjā*, 1, 4  
*anjāḥ* (acc.), 1, 3.  
*anjāḥṣṭh* (with acc.), 1, 3  
*anjāḥṣṭh* (acc.), 1, 4  
*anjāṇ* (acc.), 1, 4  
*anjāṇ*, 1, 4  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 5  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 5  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 3, 1, (instr.) 3, 1, (abl.) 3, 1,  
 (acc. plur.) 3, 1  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 2, 1, *anjāḥṣṭh* (fem.), 1, 5  
 (reading doubtful)  
*anjā*, 3, 3  
*anjāḥṣṭh* (acc.), 3, 2  
*anjāḥṣṭh* (acc. or perhaps nom.) 1, 1  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 4 (v. 1 *anjāḥṣṭh*)  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 6  
*anjāḥṣṭh* (acc. neut. ?), 3, 3  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 2, 5, *anjā*, Ś II, 7  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 2, 6  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 2, 2  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 2, 2  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 3, 5, 3, 3, *anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 3, *anjāḥṣṭh*, 2, 2  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 3  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 3  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 3  
*anjāḥṣṭh*, 1, 3.

- asobrahniogartue*, 3, 3  
*aspenamuiatah* (fcm), 2, 2, (loc plur) 1, 6, 2 1  
*asmat* (neut), 3, 3, *asye* 1, 4, 5, 2, 4, 3, 2,  
 3, *aswem* (masc.), 3, 3  
*aswehakaraih*, 1, 1  
*✓ah aka*, 3, 3  
*akah*, 1, 4, 3, 2, (acc) 3, 3, *akam*, 1, 5, 3, 3  
*aka*, 1, 6  
*ahih*, 1, 4  
  
*aguidhrye*, 1, 1  
*agurya*, 3, 3, § 1, 1  
*agya-agye*, 1, 1  
*agyiakuih* (acc), 1, 1, § 1, 4  
*afanah*, 1, 1, cf *ekahafamah*, § 1, 4  
*afmanam*, 1, 1, (dat) 3, 3, (abl) 1, 6, (gen)  
 3, 3, *afman*, 1, 6  
*adityam*, 1, 1  
*adimudham* (nom), 3, 1  
*adobhadryam* 3 2  
*✓ap tam ipayef*, 3, 3, *anadhipriyaja*, 3, 3  
*abhiplavakal*, 3, 2  
*ayulanam* (acc), 3 2  
*ayulah* (abl), 3, 1  
*ardraya* 1, 4  
*avapamam*, 3, 1  
*✓as uparyasimah*, 3, 3, (dat) 3, 3, *asimah*,  
 3, 2  
*asandhi*, 1, 4  
*asyasamuiam* (acc), 1 3  
*ahamam*, 1, 3, (nom plur) 1, 5  
  
*✓i anitayai*, 3, 3, *adhyat adhyala*, 3 3  
*anadhyam*, 3 1 *atetlah*, 3 3 *amam*, 1, 2 3  
*adhiat* (neut), 3, 3, *ups - apite* (loc neut),  
 3, 3, *pratyajit* 1 3  
*atarah*, 1, 4 *ataram* (acc. masc.), 1, 4, *atara*  
 (acc. du neut), 1, 6  
*at* 1, 1, &c. enum, 1, 3  
*atam*, 3, 2, (acc) 3, 2  
*atamut*, 3, 3  
*atam* (in quot), 1, 1, *atuk* (acc.), 1, 6  
*atu*, 3, 2 (= *at* a in sense)  
*atamotrah*, 1, 3  
*atara* *atara*, 1, 6  
  
*ayajai*, 3, 2  
*atnamam* (acc), 3, 2  
*✓it tan prutiah*, 3, 2  
  
*akthe*, 3, 1  
*akthadakah*, 3 1  
*akthapatriam* (acc), 3, 2  
*akthavuryaja* 3 1, *akthavuryam*, 1, 5, *ak*  
*thavuryam* (acc.), § 11, 16  
*akthasavipadam*, 3, 1  
*attarah*, 2, 2, (acc. masc.) 1, 1, 3, 1, (acc  
 fcm) 2, 3, 4, (instr masc) 3, 1, (gen  
 neut) 2, 5, 3 1, *attarayak* (gen), 3, 1,  
*attare* (loc), 1, 1  
*attarum* (with acc), 1, 3  
*attarah*, 1, 1, 3 4  
*attamam*, 1, 1, 2, 5, 5, 3 1, *attamat* (neut),  
 3, 2, *attamayak* (abl), 3 1, *attare* (acc  
 du fcm), 2, 5, *attamuk* (acc), 1, 1, 2,  
 3, 5  
*atathumdham* (in quot), 1, 1  
*atagagrah*, 1, 3  
*atagagare*, 1, 1  
*atatanumdhah*, 1, 2  
*ataram* 2 5  
*atathatarah*, 1, 3  
*atgala*, 1, 4  
*unmaradman* 3, 3  
*upamam*, 1, 1  
*upattamayya* 3 1, *upattamayak* (abl), 1, 1  
*ukham* (acc.), 1, 4, *ubadadhyam*, 1, 4  
*ubhayatah*, 1, 3  
*ubhayatamisthanatapharyayak* (T), 2, 1,  
*utuniah*, 2, 5  
  
*um*, 3, 1, *umam*, 1, 1 (in quot)  
*urdhvam*, 1, 3, 4, (with abl) 3, 1  
*urdhvagrantham*, 1, 3  
*urdhvayuk*, 3, 3  
  
*✓ys paryasanta* 1, 3  
*rsabha*, 1, 1, § 1, 1  
  
*ekah*, 3, 3, *ek*, 2, 2, 3, *ekny*, 2, 4, *ekamam*,  
 3 3, *ek*, 1, 6  
*ekacativimulatam*, 3, 2  
*ekapad*, 1, 2, 5, 3, 1  
*ekavipalau*, 1, 1  
*ekadatum*, 2, 2  
*ekadala* 2, 4  
*ekukam* (acc), 1, 6  
*etatfradhyatnam*, 2, 3  
*etatim*, 2, 3  
*etadidh*, 1, 6, *etididh*, 1, 6







- carmakema*, 3, 3  
*carre*, 3, 3, *carinu* (acc.), 3, 1  
*caśak*, 2, 5  
*casuilaroti* (acc.), 3, 2  
*casallarennaman'raunai*, 3, 2  
*✓caś adhyūḥa*, 3, 3, *caś*, § II, 3, *apokale*, 1, 4  
*caś*, 1, 3, 4, 5, 2, 1, 3, 3, — *ca*, 1, 3, 1, 1  
*caś*, 3, 3, *ca ca ca*, 1, 1, *ca ca*, 3, 1.  
*✓ca udvayati*, 1, 3, *caśuśa*, 1, 3  
*canan* (acc.), 1, 4  
*Caśakśajanam*, 2, 4  
*canistoh*, 3, 4  
*canavah*, 2, 1.  
*✓caś caśa*, 3, 3  
*caśakṣmaḥ*, 1, 3, *caśakṣman* (acc.), 2, 4  
*caśvayitah* (abl.), 1, 1  
*caśamitihaitamarena*, 3, 1  
*caśaravaprabārti*, 1, 1.  
*canam*, 1, 4  
*canuśak*, 1, 3, (acc.) 2, 3, (loc.) 1, 3  
*✓can parivṛte* (loc.), 1, 1.  
*✓can parivṛta* (loc. masc.), *canvṛta*, 1, 1  
*can* (dist.), 1, 4 (*canvṛta*).  
*can*, 3, 2, *canuśak*, 2, 3, better *canuś*  
*can*, 3, 3  
*caśakṣma* (masc.), 3, 3  
*can caśvat*, 3, 2, (gen.) 3, 2  
*✓canuś canuśayanti*, 1, 5  
*✓can parivṛtaka* (in quot.), 1, 1, *can*  
*canvṛta*, 1, 3, *canvṛta*, *canvṛta*, 3, 2  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 6, 3, 3, *canvṛta*, 3, 3,  
*canvṛta*, 3, 1  
*canvṛtaram*, 3, 2  
*caśakṣmaḥ*, 1, 4  
*caśakṣma*, 1, 5  
*✓canuś canvṛtamaḥ*, 3, 3  
*canvṛta*, 1, 6  
*canvṛtaka*, 1, 5  
*caśakṣma*, 1, 4, *caśakṣmaḥ*, 1, 3  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 1, 5  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 3, 3, (dist.) 3, 3  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 5  
*canvṛta*, 2, 1, (acc.) 1, 2  
*caśak*, 2, 3, 4, 3, 1, (acc.) 2, 2  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 4  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 3, 2.  
*canvṛta*, 1, 6  
*caś*, 1, 1 (perhaps nom.), 2, 2, 4, 5, 3, 1, 2  
*ca*, 1, 6  
*canvṛtaram*, 3, 1  
*canvṛtaramvṛtaram*, 2, 1  
*caśakṣmaḥ*, 3, 3  
*caśakṣma* (acc.), 1, 4  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 6, 3, 1, § II, 4  
*caśakṣma* (acc.), 1, 2.  
*caśakṣma*, 3, 3  
*canvṛtaram*, 3, 3  
*caśakṣma*, 1, 4  
*caśakṣma*, 1, 4  
*caśakṣma*, 3, 5, *caśakṣma*, 1, 4.  
*caśakṣma* (acc.), 1, 2.  
*canvṛtaram*, 1, 6, 2, 1, *canvṛtaram*, 1, 6,  
1, 6  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 3, 2, cf. *canvṛta*, § II, 1.  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 2, *canvṛta*, 1, 4, *canvṛta*,  
§ I, 7  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 3, 3, *canvṛta*, 3, 3  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 5, 1, 4, *canvṛta*, 1, 6,  
2, 1, 3, 2, § I, 4  
*canvṛta*, 1, 1  
*canvṛta*, 1, 1, § II, 1, (acc. pl.) § II, 7  
*canvṛtaramvṛta*, 2, 2, 3, 2  
*canvṛta*, 1, 5  
*canvṛta*, 3, 3  
*✓canuś canvṛta*, 1, 1, 2, § I, 5, *canvṛta*,  
3, 2, § II, 13, *canvṛta* (loc. masc.),  
1, 4, *canvṛta* (loc. neut.), 1, 1, *canvṛta*, 1,



- 1, 2, 3 2, *śiśhale*, 3, 2, *śraśiśhāśhyatī*,  
 1, 4  
*śiśhane*, 1, 6, 3, 1, 2, *śhkanamī* (acc), 1, 4,  
*śhkanāndam*, 1, 4  
*śhūne*, 1, 3, (acc. du.) 1, 3  
*śrīśrī* *urāśrīśrī*, 1, 4  
*śrayam*, 3, 3  
*śruṣema* 1, 1  
*śvasya* (neut.), 1, 4  
*śvāśhyadāharmam*, 3, 3  
  
*śa śira śa*, 1, 6, *aiśa śa*, 2, 4, *śaiva*, 3, 3,  
*śa śma*, 3, 3  
  
*śham - āghnamti*, 1, 5, *śhāśhanti*, 3, 2  
*śhu juhotsi*, 1, 1  
*śhu ahuṣa* 1, 5  
*śhr āharats*, 3, 2, *uāharats*, 3, 3, 4, 5,  
*zāharats*, 1, 6, *aiśharatī*, 1, 4, *śharyāś*, 3,  
 2, *udāśharyāśmāś*, 1, 6, *uśhryā*, 1, 6, 2,  
 3, 4, *atśhryāś*, 1, 6, *aiśharan*, ś 1, 7,  
*prataśhryā*, ś 1, 7  
*śha*, 1, 1, 4, 3, 2  
*śhrīśhryem*, 3, 3  
*śhrīśhryam* (acc v 1 °a), 1, 3  
*śhrīś*, 1, 1  
*śhrīśāś*, 1, 4, (gen) 3, 3

# INDEX VII

## BEGINNINGS OF KHANDAS OF ĀRANYAKAS

*Agam nara didhītibhīr aranyar ite annodya-*  
*domah, I, 1, 2*

*aiha āśanīkāranyah, III, 2, 2. § VIII, 2*

*aiha khaiv aṅgur nirbhujyavaktrah, III, 1, 5,*  
*§ VII, 11. Cf aihale nirbhujyapradāh, §*  
*VII, 10, and aīha vne vanyam druma nirbhu-*  
*jyavakrah, § VII, 12*

*aiha khaiv iyaṁ sarvanyai vica nṛpaṁsat, III,*  
*1, 5*

*aiha nirbhujyapradāh, III, 1, 3 Cf §*  
*VII, 10*

*aiha nīkhatya am, I, 1, 2*

*aiha śāṭhaḥṣṭya, III, 1, 2, § VII, 3*

*aiha iudadohuh, I, 4, 1*

*aiha āśmā etat Ārmanādhīrah, III, 2, 6*

*aihalah saṁhūṭaya nṛpaṁsat, III, 1, 1, § VII, 2*

*aihalo dāśīnah pakṣah, I, 4, 2*

*aihalo 'nyayakarah, III, 1, 4, § VII, 8*

*aihalo vīṭasah nṛpīh, II, 1, 2*

*arāṁmīmatra uṣari dhūmeh, I, 2, 4*

*asat m me jayatah, I, 2, 2.*

*dīmā vā idam, I, 4, 1.*

*a vā nathapi jatkhāye, I, 2, 1, § I, 3*

*dṛṣṭ 3 uy uṣa ite, II, 1, 8*

*nīṭham nīṭham ite prajā vadaṁte, II, 1, 2*

*nṛpīṣṭe sloṭre tṛaṣṭham, V, 1, 2*

*nṛv Indragṇi, V, 3, 1.*

*eta evam lakṣaṁ adhy irtat, II, 2, 1*

*eta u eta dīdhīnāṭ-nyah, II, 2, 2*

*eta paṁthā etat karma, II, 1, 1*

*asayāḥ itṛatīṣṭi, V, 2, 5*

*āś'yaṁ atmetā tṛyaṁ nṛpīmatā, II, 6*

*guyatram praugam kuryad ity aīhā, I, 1, 3*

*guyatīṣṭ tṛatīṣṭi, V, 2, 3*

*guyatram tṛatīṣṭi saṁsat, I, 4, 3*

*griva yasyatam, V, 1, 1*

*catvarak puruṣi ite Pūṭhah, III, 2, 2.*

*(Pūṭ(y)ah) § VIII, 3*

*talraṭe bhah, II, 3, 8*

*tal Savatṛ vṛṇamāhe I, 5, 3, § IX, 1, II 18*

*tal aīhā kam pramāṭya pṛeṭhātām, I,*  
*2, 3*

*tal ol uḥ khatyāṭhah pṛatīṣṭ ite, I, 3, 2*

*tal ite pṛatīṣṭyate I 3 3, 6*

*tal id asa dhūmāṁsu pṛeṭhāṁ ite pṛatīṣṭ at-*  
*etat tava, I, 3 4*

*tal id asa dhūmāṁsu pṛeṭhāṁ ite pṛatīṣṭyate*  
*jat nā, I, 3 7*

*tal id asa dhūmāṁsu pṛeṭhāṁ tam me te kṛitī*  
*V, 1, 6*

*tal id idam bhṛatīśahatram saṁpāṇnam tal*  
*jatāh, II, 3, 7*

*tal ta idam bhṛatīśahatram saṁpāṇnam tal*  
*hatat, II 3 5*

*tal na idam bhṛatīśahatram saṁpāṇnam tṛy-*  
*yaṁ, II, 2, 4*

*tal vā idam bhṛatīśahatram saṁpāṇnam tṛya-*  
*ta etāya, II, 3 6*

*tam dāta pṛanayantā, II, 2, 4*

*tam pṛapadobhṛtām pṛaṣa iṣat, II, 1, 4*

*tasya ja atmanam, II, 3, 2*

*tasya tāt tātīṣṭi, II, 2, 6*

*tasya vāṁ vṛṇam, II, 2, 7*

*ta et dīdhīṣṭi, II, 4, 2*

*tā matṛm tīharatī pṛuṣṭe vāi nāṣṭi, I, 3 5*

*ta matṛm tīharatī pṛuṣṭe vāi nāṣṭi, I, 3, 8*

duṣṭhāśokā arya utā bhāwanti, III, 2, 4

naḥśikṣiṣā mahāṛṣṭam samīc, V, 1, 3

nirīhite prakṛte lokā e māni andamīcaram, V,  
1, 4

ṣṭu e ha tū aṣṭam dāste garbhā, II, 5, 1

ṣṭa vo māhe mnu tam uvaḥśulhasa, I, 5, 2

ṣṭaśloṣam samīcīte, I, 1, 5

ṣṭine samā itī Śāṅkīraḥ Śaḥśyā, III, 2, 1,  
§ VIII, 1

śikṣāś tṛaṣṭī, V, 2, 4

śyādrathāntarāyo rūṣena III, 1, 6, śyādra  
śāntārena rūṣena, § V II, 19

śāhī vaśatya pāṭhacī uśatim i mūḥṣenyā, I,  
1, 1

śārdī i loḥśmāś aś, V, 3, 2

śāśṭam śāśī ṣṭaśṣaś, I, 1, 3

yo ha i ṣṭimāśam, II, 3, 1.

śo ha tū pāśī, II, 3, 4

vāśāntaro dāśīmaś pāśī, V, 2, 2

vaśam samīcī, I, 5, 1, aśa aśam śaśā  
§ II, 11

vāś me śāśāś, II, 1, 1

vāśo śyāś, I, 1, 4

vāś maghātām, II, 1, 1.

Vāśamīcram hy eśāś aśāś, II, 1, 3

va śāśāś na śāśī, II, 4, 3

va śāśamīcram śāśāś, II, 3, 3

śāśāśāśāś aśāś, I, 3, 1

## PRATĪKAS IN ŚĀNKHILĀYANA ĀRANYAKA I, II, VII-XV.

agṛiḥ pāṭhāśam, VII 5

aśāśāśam śāśāśam i śāśāś, VIII, 9

aśāśāśam śāśāśam i śāśāś, IX, 8

aśāśāśam VIII, 4

aśāśāśam śāśāśam i śāśāś, IX, 13

aśāśāśam śāśāśam i śāśāś, X III, 10

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, X 1

aśāśāśam śāśāśam i śāśāś, VII 21

aśāśāśam śāśāśam i śāśāś, XIII

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, XI, 3

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 3

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 14

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 13

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 11

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 5

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 15

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 7

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, I 4

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 12

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II 11

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 2

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 4

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, XI, 7

aśāśāśam śāśāśam, XI 8

śāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 10

śāśāśam śāśāśam, VIII, 5

śāśāśam śāśāśam, XI

śāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 20

śāśāśam śāśāśam śāśāśam śāśāśam, XV

śāśāśam śāśāśam, VIII, 4

śāśāśam śāśāśam, VIII 7

śāśāśam śāśāśam, XIII, 4

śāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 16

śāśāśam śāśāśam, II, 17

śāśāśam śāśāśam, I, 7

śāśāśam śāśāśam, I, 2

śāśāśam śāśāśam, I, 5

śāśāśam śāśāśam śāśāśam śāśāśam, VII, 11

śāśāśam śāśāśam śāśāśam śāśāśam, VII, 4

śāśāśam śāśāśam, VIII, 8

śāśāśam śāśāśam, VIII, 11

śāśāśam śāśāśam, XI, 1

śāśāśam śāśāśam, I, 1.

*prapa pmutavram*, VII, 17.

*prano locakramia*, IX, 7

*mano locakramia*, IX, 6.

*malan indra*, II, 8

*maia pmutavram*, VII, 15

*pat ityoma soevudam*, VIII, 6

*pa ipta*, II, 9

*yo ha vai gyuttham ca*, IX, 1

*val pmutavram*, VII, 7

*val prameya samahajate*, VII, 14

*val samahajate*, VII, 18

*ton mama*, XI, 2

*vaci me 'gnih praisijhate vohā*, XI, 5

*vaci me 'gnih praisijhate vohā*, XI, 6

*Vidvāntro ha va*, I, 6

*ivatram locakramia*, IX, 5

*sam val prameya*, I, 8

*sa tptat pramam tarjayate*, X, 3

*sa tptat cakur tarjayate*, X, 4

*sa tptat ivatram tarjayate*, X, 6

*sa tptat tad etad*, X, 8

*sa tptat manas tarjayate*, X, 5

*sa tptat vatas tarjayate*, X, 7

*sa tptat vacam tarjayate*, X, 9

*sa yade pranam*, VII, 9

*sarvā vohā vohā*, VII, 12

*sa ha val*, VIII, 3

*hastavacatam prastat me*, XII

*hastavacatam prastat me*, XII, 1

## VIII. INDEX TO INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

(Only the more important points are here referred to. References to the Introduction are to pages, to the Notes to the *Āraṇyakas*.)

Abuse, employment of, in ritual, V, 1, 5, n. 17.

Āgamaśruti Śāstra, 28.

Agastya, 17, 33.

Aitareya *Āraṇyaka*, MSS of, 1-11, commentaries on, 11-15, divisions of, 14-26, the Mahāvratā in, 26-39, the Upanisads of, 26-51, style and grammar, 51-74; relation of I and V, I, 2, 3, n. 5, date of III, III, 1, 1, n. 2.

Aitareya Brahmana, 16 sq., relation to Kauṣṭhika Brahmana, 30-33, style and grammar, 81, 66, 67.

Ānandavibha, *śūtra* on Śaṅkara's *Advaita*, 11, 12, 13 sq., 12.

Āpatamba, knows Vedānta (?), 26.

Āraṇyaka, meaning of, 12, III, 2, 6, n. 11.

Āśvalāyana, "author" of *Āraṇyaka* IV (?), 18, 19, Śrauta Sūtra quoted in *Āraṇyaka*, V, 3, 2, n. 14, relation to Śaṅkara, *ibid.*

Atharvaviraś Upanisad, known to Gaṇṇa, 16.

Ātman, doctrine of, 40 sq.

Bahvyaś Brahmana Upanisad, 38.

Bṛhadarṇyaka Upanisad, relation to Aitareya *Āraṇyaka* II, III, 41, 44-46.

Bṛhaddevata, comparison of grammar of, with Aitareya *Āraṇyaka*, 71.

Buddhism, relation to Aitareya *Āraṇyaka* II, III, 47-49.

Chāndogya Upanisad, relation to Aitareya *Āraṇyaka* II, III, 41, 44-46.

Chariots (*trakṣas*), I, 5, 3, n. 6.

Deussen, discussion of theory of significance of Upanisads, 41 sq.

Epic, date of, 50; I, 5, 2, n. 19.

Fire, significance of use of, in ritual, V, 3, 1, n. 21.

Fire altar, bird form of, 101 sq., V, 1, 2, notes 2 and 3.

Gaṇṇa, knows Atharvaviraś Upanisad, 16.

Gatamaśruti, 17, 26.

Gopikaś Brahmana, date of, 25, 26, cf. *I O J*, XII, 191 sq.

Grammar (including Accidence, Syntax, and Vocabulary).

### a ENGLISH INDEX.

Cases, 38, 39, 62, 69, Accus. with  $\sqrt{man}$  alternating with nom., III, 1, 4, n. 3, with *bra* (two accus.), III, 1, 3, n. 6, *f A O S*, XVIII, 378 sq., 398 sq.; Instr. with *antar* +  $\sqrt{e}$ , V, 3, 3, n. 21, with causative of  $\sqrt{śan}$ , III, 2, 4, n. 16; Dat. with *man*, V, 1, 6, n. 3; Gen. predicative, I, 2, 2, n. 8, 3, 4, n. 10, II, 1, 4, n. 7, V, 3, 3, n. 2, partitive, with possessive adj., I, 2, 3, n. 6, with verb (*yaj*), V, 3, 3, n. 3; absolutely, II, 3, 1, n. 6, defining, IV, 1, n. 3, V, 1, 6, n. 3, construction of whole and part, I, 1, 4, p. 5, nom., II, 3, 8, n. 11.

\* What is given in the Introduction is not repeated in the Index.

- Compounds*, *anyanetive* adjectival *Uyan*  
*ava*, I, 3, 3, n 4
- Concord*, attraction of predicate, V, 2, 1,  
 n 14, plural for dual (?), I, 1, 2, n 7;  
 V, 2, 2, n 12, superlative agrees with  
 subject, I, 2, 4, n 6, *mase* after *mase*  
 and neut, II, 1, 7, n 1, neut adj pred,  
 III, 1, 2, n 4
- Miscellaneous lengthening of vowels*, II, 3, 8,  
 n 9 V, 2, 2, n 12, *improvis*, III, 1, 2, n 2
- Modi*, 61-63, Conditional, III, 1, 4,  
 n 3, Imperative in *sat*, V, 1, 5, n 1,  
 Optative of characteristic, II, 1, 2, n 3,  
 III, 2, 3, n 3, indefinite, III, 2, 1, n 1,  
 V, 3, 2, n 11 *f R A S*, 1909, p 151.  
 Imperative, I, 5, 2, n 8
- Numerals*, use of acc for nom., II, 2, 4,  
 3, 3, V, 1, 1, n 1.
- Particles*, 65, 66, use of *sa*, I, 1, 2, n 3,  
 use of *no*, V, 3, 3, n 12, use of *cama*,  
 III, 1, 3, n 6, use of *sat*, II, 1, 1,  
 n 10, 5, n 5
- Prepositions* 59, *adhi* with acc, II, 3, 1,  
 n 6, *adhi* with acc, I 4 2 n 7, *apti*  
 with acc, II, 2, 5, n 8, *abhi* with  
 acc, V, 3, 2, n 6, *sutrena* with acc,  
 V, 3, 1, n 6, *pure* with acc, I, 5, 1,  
 n 13, *palat* with gen, V, 1, 4, n 15
- Pronouns*, 58, *enam* III, 1 4, n 3
- Sandhi*, 55, irregular contraction of vowels,  
 III 1, 3, n 2, 2 4 n 11, V, 3 2, n 9.  
*of am*, V, 1, 6, n 4
- Tenses*, 59-62, Perfect and Imperfect, I,  
 2, 1, n 6, cf *f R A S*, 1909, p 150,  
 Perfect, original force of, II, 1, 8, n 8
- Verbal Nouns and Participles*, 63, 64,  
*infin* in *sa*, I, 1, 1, n 4, gerund and  
*partic* with *mon*, III, 1, 4, n 3, 2, 4,  
 n 7, gerund (time of), I, 3, 1, n 1
- Poke*, use of middle as passive in perfect  
 forms, III, 1, 1, n 3, in present and  
 imperfect V, 2, 2, n 14; in participle,  
 I, 2 2, n 5
- § SANSKRIT INDEX
- ananyatām*, I, 2, 2, n 11
- atishā*, I, 2 2, n 11, I, 1, 6,
- atishā*, I, 1, 1, n 6
- ananyatām*, I, 4, 1, n 11
- anyā 'nyam*, III, 1, 6, n 7.
- abhiyuktas* (?), III, 1, 6, n 5
- aver eke*, II, 7, n 1.
- aiyā bhāṭayan*, III, 2, 3, n 4
- akṣar* I, 2, 2, n 11
- akṣodake*, V, 3, 3, n 17
- akṣarāyāt*, V, 3 3, n 22.
- ānāṣ*, I, 4, 1, n 9
- nakṣ* (?), III, 2, 5
- mana*, V, 1, 4, n 11
- paran* II, 4, 3, n 2 Cf *Int Stud*,  
 XVII, 190
- brahma*, III, 2, 3, 304, 367
- raṣṭantaro*, V, 1, 3, n 3
- āṣṭ*, 23
- zama*, V, 1, 4, n 3
- vyākṣ*, V, 2, 1, n 2
- saṁbhaṣanā*, I, 4 7, n 10
- smu* (?) III, 1, 2, n 4
- Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana* 46, V, 3, 2, n 3
- Āṭyāyana*, grammarian date of, 22, 24
- Āṭyāyana*, author of *Sarvaśāstram*, 21, 24
- Kaṇvaka Brahmana*, relation to *Āṭyāyana*  
 Brahmana, 31 33, 39
- Kaṇvaka Upaniṣad*, relation to *Āṭyāyana* *Ām*  
*nyāṣ* II, III, 4, n 2, 46
- Āṭyāyana*, interest in philosophy, 20, III, 2 6,  
 n 11, *f R A S*, 1908, pp 568 sq
- Magical rites*, I, 2, 3, n 1, V, 1, 5, notes 13, 14,  
 15 and 17
- Mahadevika*, 12
- Mahāntareya*, 21, 39
- Mahāntareya Upaniṣad*, 29
- Mahāntareya*, 18, IV, n 1
- Mahāvata*, 26-39, see my *Saṁkṣipta Ām*  
*nyāṣ*, pp 73-85
- Mahāntareya*, 16 17, I, 2, 1, n 4, II,  
 3, 5, n 4, III, 2, 6, n 12.
- Mantra*, style of, I, 2, 5, n 7, V, 3 2, n 17
- Manuscript*, description of, 2-3, value of, 12.
- Maruṭvāṣa*, 28
- Metre*, II, 2, 8, n 1
- Kṛtāṣṭ*, 17.
- Śaṁkṣipta*, 28



OXFORD

PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

BY HORACE HART, M.A.

PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY